

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07096563 7



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation





FEB 20 1954

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1891.

THE SOURCES OF THEOLOGY.

AMONG the classic works on theology which saw the light in the latter half of the sixteenth century, Melchior Cano's *De Locis Theologicis* holds a prominent place. Like many other classics it is probably but little read at the present day. Still its name, at any rate, is known to most students of theology as that of a standard authority; and it has a real though indirect influence on their studies. The importance of this book has been recognised from the first. The censor appointed to examine it is loud in its praise, both for the classic purity of its language and the deep learning which it displays. Few readers will be likely to dispute its claim to high praise on both of these grounds. Yet, I would venture to say that neither the one nor the other can be considered the chief merit of this "golden book," as Cardinal Pallavicino has justly called it. For learning and theological acumen, Cano stands in the foremost rank. His Latin, again, is that of the humanist rather than that of the schoolman. But his book was something more than all this. It was the word in season. We can give no higher praise to a writer than this, that he has treated fully and successfully that which is the burning question of his day. And this is the real merit of Cano's work.

True, the doctrines of the faith are not of an age, but for all time. In every period of her history the Church sets before her children the same sacred mysteries; and all, or

well-nigh all her dogmas have been repeatedly assailed and called in question. Nevertheless, in each age there is generally some one doctrine which holds the foremost place. None of the others are forgotten by the Church, and few escape the profane hands of her enemies. But this one is at once the chief object of heretical assault and of patristic exposition. It is scarcely necessary to dwell here on the question of doctrinal development. The very phrase reminds us of one of the chief writings of that great teacher whom we have so lately lost. And who can hope to add anything to what Cardinal Newman has said in that masterly essay? It will be enough here to point out the order which is discernible in the course of that development. We can hardly fail to see it, if we look at the grand array of General Councils, and the great works of the early Fathers and others of each succeeding age, and mark what dogmas chiefly occupy their attention, or what errors they are refuting and condemning.

The whole history of Catholic theology may, indeed, be likened to a scholastic course, wherein the doctrines of the faith are unfolded one by one in due succession. First comes the preliminary work of the early apologists, St. Justin, and Athenagoras, and St. Theophilus. Then follows the theology, properly so called. The doctrine concerning the nature of God, and distinction of the Divine Persons, is unfolded by the Fathers of the third and fourth centuries. St. Dionysius and St. Gregory the Wonderworker, vindicate the distinction of the Persons against the Manichean heretics; and their labours are followed up and completed by St. Athanasius and St. Hilary, and their great compeers. These defend the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, denied by Arians or Macedonians. And the doctrines they expound and vindicate are set forth in authoritative form by the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople.

The theology is naturally followed by the economy or the doctrine of the divine Incarnation; and St. Cyril of Alexandria succeeds to the chair of St. Athanasius. The Nestorian separation is condemned and refuted by St. Cyril and the Fathers of Ephesus. And their work is, in turn, completed by the labours of St. Leo and the Council of

Chalcedon, where the opposite error of Eutyches is rejected, and the Catholic doctrine is more clearly and explicitly defined. At the same period, the doctrine on grace was being assailed by the Pelagians, and receiving its vindication and exposition at the hands of St. Augustine and his disciples.

For a considerable time after this Fathers and Councils were engaged in refuting and proscribing the various offshoots of the great heresies of Nestorius, Eutyches, and Pelagius. And then writers like St. Anastasius of Sinai, and St. John of Dāmascus began to bring together and consolidate the work of their predecessors; a task which was continued in the succeeding period. The chief work of the mediæval schoolmen was their careful consideration and lucid exposition of the sacramental system; to which must be added the improvement in form and ordered arrangement which theology received at their hands.

Now it may be observed that in these earlier controversies the point at issue is generally some portion of the objective truth delivered to us by revelation, and not the channels whereby that truth is conveyed. It is, indeed, true, that from the first the heretics were often in error concerning the Holy Scripture or the authority of the Church. As Moehler tells us, a false conception of the office of Scripture and tradition was the one common principle of the most widely-different heresies. Still these sources of theology were not as yet the main subject of discussion. The heretics, whatever their real principles, were often so far from open self-denial of such authorities, that they appealed to tradition as well as to Scripture in support of their teaching; and instead of disputing the power of Councils they summoned Councils of their own. For a time, at least, these questions were removed from the region of controversy. But their turn was to come. Like the mysteries of the faith which they guard and convey, the sources of theology were to become the object of attack from the enemies of truth, to be ably defended, and to have their nature and their office more clearly set forth and defined. Herein lies the real battle-ground between truth

and falsehood in these latter days. To see this we need only take up the *De Locis Theologicis*, and glance at the headings of the various books and chapters. The authority of Holy Scripture, of Apostolic traditions, of the Catholic Church, of the Councils, of the Holy See, of the Fathers and theologians, the arguments of natural reason, of philosophy, and of history: such are the topics treated by Melchior Cano. In any age, these questions would be full of interest and worthy of attention. But their momentous importance, and the advantage of an ordered treatment of them can be better appreciated now than at any other time. We look at the book with other eyes, and read it by the light of recent history. For us it contains not merely truth and order; it sets forth those very truths against which later heretics have directed their chief assaults, and the order whereof the violation has wrought such havoc around us. These various authorities and sources of theology are, as it were, the marks on which the succeeding waves of anti-religious revolt have been beating for the last four hundred years.

While the Fathers of the fifth and sixth centuries were unfolding and systematizing the Catholic doctrine on the Incarnation, the heretics of that day were putting forth a series of varying and conflicting views on the same great mystery. The doctrinal development was accompanied by a ceaseless variation in the opposing heresies. These two movements on the field of doctrine present a singular and striking contrast in their character, their methods, and what may be called their laws of motion. The one is marked by its unity and harmony; the other is all chaos and contradiction. Such is certainly the case here, with the sources of theology. In the Catholic system, as it is put before us by Cano, the various authorities are all bound together, and bear witness in one voice to the unchanging truth. What light flows forth from the sacred writings while the Church is by to guard and interpret them! The message of the written word is further supplemented and elucidated by the Apostolic traditions. The Councils establish and declare the truth; while they bear witness at the same time to the

authority of the successor of St. Peter, who calls them together and sanctions their decisions. Peter speaks, and the cause is ended. And then the heart of the faithful people takes up and echoes the words of its teachers. Natural reason, philosophy, and history have each their rightful office, humbler though it be. All are parts of one harmonious whole. They work in unison; they result in unity.

When we turn to the other camp, the first thing that strikes us is the violation of this order and harmony. Here there has ever been a tendency to set up some one of the authorities or sources of truth, and disparage the others. Undercurrents were, no doubt, at work long before the open revolt. We may, however, conveniently date the movement from its outbreak in the days of the Western schism.

The first stage is the attempt of certain theologians at Pisa, Constance, and Basle to set the Councils above the Pope. Following close on this we have the Reformers setting up Scripture as the sole authority to the disparagement of Pope and Council, Church and tradition. And more recently, we find one of the secondary sources—natural reason—exalted above all the others. Such are, in brief outline, the chief stages of this fatal movement. It is hardly necessary to add that in every case the exaltation was really illusory. To sever the Councils from their true head and ruler, is to degrade them. To wrest the Bible from the guardian hands of the Church, and give it to the fickle multitude, that they may interpret and misinterpret it as they list, is, after all, a strange kind of honour.

The real character of the whole movement is best seen when we come to consider the connection of each wave with that which follows it. The leaders themselves may be loth to acknowledge this relationship, but it exists for all that. Gallican theologians may condemn the errors of the Reformers, and raise their voices in defence of divine tradition and the Councils of Holy Church: Bible Christians may cry out with horror at the treatment which Holy Scripture suffers at the hands of modern rationalists: yet the errors they both condemn, are none the less the natural outcome of their own principles, and of the course which

they and their forerunners have pursued. What authority can hope to escape in the struggle when once the due order is disturbed?

“Take but degree away, untune that string,
And, hark! what discord follows! each thing meets
In mere oppugnancy; the bounded waters
Should lift their bosoms higher than the shores,
And make a sop of all this solid globe . . .
Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself.”

What Shakespeare here says, may well be applied to the revolution in theology, wherein rebellious reason plays the part of lawless appetite. Those who, from whatever motive, began in the troublous days of the great schism to set themselves against the due pre-eminence of the Holy See were entering on a path fraught with danger. A Catholic who has a true sense of the Pope's divine commission can hardly wonder at the evils which have followed from this attack on his authority. But even without this light it is possible to see the vast importance of this initial revolt. One of the most learned and acute of modern Protestant historians has pointed to the course adopted at the Council of Pisa as the real beginning of the Reformation.¹

The relationship between the Reformers and modern rationalists is even more easily recognised. Some of the latter are wont to honour Luther and his comrades as the men who first freed the mind of Europe from the trammels of authority, and became the forerunners of the greater prophets of this enlightened age. In one sense, indeed, this is very far from the truth. There is much in the theology of the early Reformers which would sound strangely in the ears of Rationalists or Liberals. Characterized by a narrow-minded dogmatism, they scout the schoolmen as rationalists,

¹ Gregorovius (*Geschichte der Stadt Rom.*, B. vi., G. B. 12, c. 5), speaking of the action of the Pisan Council, says “Es war bereits die Reformation.”

and condemn the very name of reason. Nevertheless, by their assault on the Catholic Church they were opening the way to others who would go to greater lengths. Nor is it matter of wonder if the attempt to make the Bible the sole source of religious truth has led to the practical rejection of that divine authority. Here, at least, Hegel's doctrine holds good. A principle isolated and carried to its extreme limit culminates in its own negation.¹ Already, in the Reformation days there were some theologians who could see whither the movement was really tending. Gregory of Valentia, writing in the sixteenth century, says that the principles of the sectaries of his time, would lead to absolute unbelief, if only they were followed up consistently; and he expresses some wonder that those who rejected the teaching of the Church, from which we receive the Scripture itself, should continue to believe anything.² The justice of his language can be more easily felt now that the revolt against authority has, in so many places, reached that consistent development of which Valentia speaks. There are still many individuals or religious bodies, lingering in the preliminary stages—"frozen up between Protestant principles and their legitimate conclusions," to use a figure of Cardinal Newman's. But such is no longer the dominant spirit in the world of thought outside the Church and over against her. It is not the papal authority alone that is now assailed; Church and Councils, Scripture and tradition, all are called in question or openly rejected. We have reached—if we have not already passed—the last stage of theological decay, when all supernatural authority is made subject to mere natural reason, or to something which usurps that name.

And here again the Hegelian principle is exemplified. The worship of reason ends in its negation. Like "appetite, an universal wolf," rebellious reason has made "an universal prey, and at last eats up himself." It began by rejecting the authority of revelation and claiming to judge of all things, human or divine; and it ends by doubting of its own powers—nay, its own existence. Rationalism is fitly

¹ *Encyklop.*, i. 81.

² *Analysis Fidei Catholicae*, line i., cap. i.

succeeded by a crude materialism, which is the negation of reason, or a hopeless agnosticism which despairs of knowing anything.

Such is the ultimate issue of the religious revolution of the last four centuries. And it is, surely, disheartening enough. But there is, withal, a brighter side to the picture. There is nothing so bad that good is not eventually drawn from it. In the ceaseless ever-shifting struggle between truth and falsehood, the victory lies with the truth; and, moreover, it is no barren victory. The assailants of the faith are beaten back; but this is not all: positive gain accrues to the cause of truth from the conflicts they have provoked. In the words of St. Augustine, the Church makes use of them for her own advancement. When St. John was thrown into the cauldron of boiling oil, he came forth with fresh beauty and vigour. And the same may be said of those truths which are cast into the fiery crucible of religious controversy. They come out from it whole and sound, but brighter and fairer than before. Not that they are changed in their nature: God forbid! But they are more fully expressed and more clearly defined. The searching questions of heretics have drawn forth timely answers from the champions who are never wanting in the hour of need. And the period of controversy is followed by some decision of Pope or Council which sets its seal upon the more complete and luminous statement of the doctrine which the discussion has elicited. We are thus in some sense beholden to the importunate questions or attacks of heretics for many of the chief Conciliar definitions, and many of the treasures of patristic literature. So was it in the age of Arius and Nestorius; and so it is with the errors of these later days.

I. Thus the long-continued assault on the papal authority has borne its measure of fruit. In the rich literature on this topic we find the true office and prerogatives of the successor of St. Peter clearly set forth and vigorously defended. The earlier onslaught was met by Bellarmine and the other great controversialists of his age. And the questions which they handled with such conspicuous success had

further light thrown upon them towards the end of the last century, when the attacks of Hontheim—better known as Febronius—summoned fresh champions to the field. At length the long and exhaustive discussion drew to a close, and the doctrine thus ably vindicated and lucidly explained received its final sanction in the Vatican Council.

II. Much the same may be said of the doctrine concerning the nature and office of the Church. Here also the false teaching of the Reformers has drawn forth from Catholic writers a large amount of valuable work. We are perhaps somewhat apt, nowadays, to under-estimate the task which fell to the lot of these champions of the truth. They have done their work so thoroughly, that we who have entered into their labours can scarcely realize the state of things at the opening of this great controversy. The theologian of to-day who has to deal with this question has not far to seek for information or for arguments. In the countless treatises on the Church he will find this doctrine treated with scholastic precision, and supported by a goodly array of arguments brought together from the sacred text or the writings of the Fathers. The subject has been considered in all its aspects : the reasons weighed and sifted, the objections encountered, the difficulties cleared up. But how much of all this was done in the days of the mediæval schools? Cardinal Bellarmine, in the opening chapter of his treatise on the Church gives us a list of those who had laboured before him in this field—or rather of those among them whose writings he had read. And the first name after the early Fathers St. Cyprian, St. Optatus, and St. Augustine, is that of the English Carmelite Thomas Netter, of Walden, who flourished in the days of the Council of Pisa. The fact is rarely significant. The treatise *De Ecclesia* opens along with the revolt against Church authority ; the discussion was becoming the need of the age.

And here also the Vatican Council comes to set its seal upon the theological work which had gone before it. Earlier Councils had already put forth more than one canon bearing on this doctrine, for the most part indirectly or in disciplinary decisions. But here the Church of Christ is the subject of

one of the main dogmatic decrees. Unhappily, the interruption of the Council robs this decree of its due completeness.

III. In like manner, the errors concerning the authority of Holy Scripture have led to a clearer explanation of the real office of the sacred writings, and their relation to the Church, which guards and interprets them. And the doctrine which our great controversialists have set forth and vindicated receives its sanction in the Tridentine and Vatican decrees on Holy Scripture.

At the same time Catholic commentators came forward to meet the false interpretations of the Reformers by giving a sound and solid exposition of the sacred text. Cornelius à Lapide and Maldonatus have found worthy successors in the late commentators of Catholic Germany—men like Thalhoffer and Reithmayr, and many more, who combine the advantage of modern scholarship with loyalty to the teaching of the Church.

IV. Still more remarkable is the good work which has been done in setting forth the true office of divine tradition. The errors of the heretics on this subject have led their opponents to dwell on the importance of this channel of revealed truth, explaining its nature, and meeting the objections brought against it. Meanwhile the labours of Petavius and Thomassinus, and still more those of the Benedictines of St. Maur, threw a flood of light on the writings of the early Fathers, and displayed the treasures therein contained. Nor were the other monuments of antiquity neglected. Génér directed the attention of theologians to the Catacombs, and their inscriptions as a further witness to the doctrines of the ancient Church. And the more recent researches of de Rossi and others have made this source of information accessible to all. A fresh field was opened by the study of the ancient liturgies, to which Renaudot and Assemani, and more lately Denzinger, have devoted themselves with such happy results. Their labours supply the theologian with a fund of valuable information and cogent arguments.

And in setting up the unanimous consent of the Fathers, as a standard of Scripture interpretation which may not be gainsaid, the Council of Trent has given its sanction to the

true view of tradition—a sanction which has been renewed in the Vatican Council.

V. Much the same may be said concerning the authority of Councils. Bellarmine and the other opponents of the Reformers have been at pains to explain the nature and office of the Councils of Holy Church, and vindicate their authority against the attacks of the heretics. At the same time such men as Hardouin, Labbé, and Mansi, and in our own days, Hefele, have done for the Councils what Petavius and the Benedictines did for the patristic writings.

And in the bull wherewith he opened the Vatican Council, Pope Pius IX. solemnly teaches the Catholic doctrine concerning the Councils of the Church and their authority.

VI. The controversy on the office of reason in theology has, naturally enough, been fought out in the present century. While the rationalism, in which the Lutheran revolt culminated, was finding an echo in certain schools within the Church, the so-called traditionalists went to the other extreme, and denied that reason had any power of arriving at the knowledge of religious truth without the aid of revelation. As Scheeben truly says, this was the old struggle stirred up by Jansenists in the one extreme, or Pelagians in the other; only that the conflict was removed from the field of ethics to that of knowledge. And in both cases the solution lay in the distinction between two orders, whether of holiness or knowledge, the natural and the supernatural. In spite of his weakness and liability to err, man is able by the native light of reason to come to some knowledge of natural theology. But there is a whole world of supernatural truth beyond his ken, and some knowledge of this is vouchsafed him by revelation and faith. At the same time fresh light is thrown upon those religious truths which are within the range of reason, and they are now seen with a fulness and freedom from error to which unaided reason had never attained. And then, purified and elevated by supernatural light, man's reason has the office of arranging in order the heavenly truths delivered by revelation, and entering, so far as may be, into their meaning, though their depths can never be fathomed.

Such is the true office of reason in religious science, as it is set forth and vindicated by Catholic theologians. And this doctrine, again, has been enunciated and sanctioned by the Vatican Council. Seldom has a controverted question been so completely cleared up in the authoritative teaching of the Church as is the case here. With this luminous decree before us, who shall say that the discussion which elicited it has been in vain?

VII. Another of these secondary and subsidiary sources of theological argument is philosophy, or the authority of the philosophers. This is a source of which the mediæval schoolmen availed themselves very largely, to the great advantage of theological science. In its turn this became the subject of many erroneous views. There were those among the Reformers who sought to banish philosophy from the field of theology, and roundly condemned the schoolmen for the use they made of it. That noble philosophic system which had grown up under the shelter of the Church, combining and harmonizing all that was best in the two great philosophers of antiquity, was rudely thrust aside by the Reformers and their followers. And even some Catholic writers have been found to swell the ranks of its enemies, and cultivate instead some one of those fragmentary, and so far erroneous systems, which have arisen in its place.

But here, as elsewhere, good is drawn from the evil. The office of philosophy, as the handmaid of theology, has been explained and defended by the Catholic champions, and the need of a sound system has been often insisted upon. Such writers as Balmes and Kleutgen have done much to restore the supremacy of the true philosophy of the schools; while the recent course of philosophic development outside the Church has tended, at least indirectly, towards the same result.

Here we could not well look for the same ecclesiastical sanction which has been given in the other cases. A system of philosophy can hardly be made the subject of a Conciliar or papal definition, like an article of the faith. Nevertheless, even here the voice of authority has not been wanting. Various errors on this question were from time to time

condemned by Pope Pius IX. And, at last, the work done by the champions of the scholastic system was worthily crowned and sanctioned by the noble encyclical on Christian philosophy, issued by the present Pontiff in the earlier years of his reign.

VIII. From philosophy it is only natural to pass to history, which is philosophy teaching by example. This is the last of the sources enumerated by Cano ; and it may, perhaps, be reckoned last in the order of importance. Nevertheless, it has its use, and may often stand the theologian in good stead. Profane history affords many tokens of divine providence, and so adds its voice to those of the other witnesses of natural theology. The history of the Church in the midst of the world is of far greater importance, and plainly speaks of her divine origin, and shows us that she is ever upheld by the hand that fashioned her.

And here, again, we meet with the same story of error on the one hand, and defence of truth on the other ; and, once more, the issue of the conflict is the same. Breaking with the past, the leaders of the Reformation could look for little comfort from this quarter ; and some, at least, of their successors seem so far conscious of their position that they fight shy of history. Though they boast of their primitive Christianity, and condemn the "innovations" of Rome, they often neglect to seek any historical basis for their claims. Others, however, have made a bold attempt to supply the deficiency. From the days of the Magdeburg Centuriators we have had a series of polemical histories, wherein the prejudice, if not the downright bad faith, of some writers, and the ignorance or credulity of others, combine in presenting a strangely distorted picture of the past. In the well-worn words of De Maistre : "History has been, for the last three centuries, a conspiracy against truth."

Besides those who neglect history and those who thus write it backwards, there are others who have erred in their conception of its office. We have heard much in recent years of the "appeal to history," and an attempt has been made to set up this otherwise neglected source as the sole arbiter of controversy, and to judge the living Church of the

present by that of some earlier centuries chosen at will—or, rather, by a misconstruction of the past.

Here, once more, the bane is speedily followed by the antidote. Baronius entered the field against the Centuriators, and many others have been found to carry on the work so worthily begun, and paint a faithful picture of the early Church. Meanwhile, Petavius and the Benedictines of St. Maur, by their labours in chronology, and their study of ancient documents, were laying the foundations of modern historical criticism; and Bossuet, following in the footsteps of St. Augustine, was taking a broad and deep view of the whole course of history, and reading its meaning, thus giving the world a religious philosophy of history, while Herder and Hegel were yet unborn. Other writers in our own days have known how to profit by these labours, and build on the foundations thus securely laid.

And while the real importance of history is thus recognized by our foremost champions, they have at the same time repudiated that view of its office which sets it above the living Church. Cardinal Newman has raised his voice against this error, in the latest, and not the least remarkable of his books. And who has had more of the true historian's spirit, or has felt the force of the historic agreement, more vividly than he?

Nor are the labours of our historians left without some share of that ecclesiastical sanction which has been given in the case of philosophers and theologians. The present Holy Father has followed up his encyclical on philosophy by his letter on historical studies.¹ And by opening the treasures of the papal archives and the Vatican Library he has done much to advance those historical studies which he enjoins by his words.

The above record, imperfect as it needs must be, is yet enough to show something of the advantage gained by Catholic theology in the course of the last three centuries. The advance has been continuous and consistent. Fresh light has surely been thrown on those questions to which

¹ *Letter to Cardinals de Luca, Pitra, and Hergenröther*, August 18, 1883.

Cano's sagacity called the attention of theologians three hundred years ago. And it may be seen that the recent acts of the Holy Father are not arbitrary or isolated, but a continuance, or rather a part of the development, of theological science. He is crowning, and in a manner completing, the work of centuries.

W. H. KENT, O.S.C.

THE CATHOLIC TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT: THE SUREST WAY TO ITS SUCCESS.—I.

THE inauguration of this movement on Passion Sunday last, was hailed with hopeful joy by our people and their friends, all the world over. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster sent to the Archbishop of Dublin the cheering augury:—"On St. Patrick's Day I said Mass for Ireland and for your great work on Passion Sunday. It will, I believe, save Ireland." Are these hopes sure to be realized, and how soon? Indeed a grand and elaborate plan has been put before us; but for success, we require energetic, and some say even enthusiastic action upon the surest lines. Upon these points the readers of the I. E. RECORD will allow a fellow-worker to submit the following thoughts.

THE TRUE ISSUE.

No small harm may result if public attention be diverted from the real object of this movement. This object does not involve the question whether we are not so bad as other people. Neither are we concerned about the abstract merits of total abstinence. Again, it is not to our purpose to impugn the liberty, or dispute the security of persons who use God's gifts with conscientious discretion. These and other questions may come indirectly before us; but our true issue is, *the promotion of the glory of God and the salvation of souls by the suppression of intemperance*

amongst our respective flocks. This end is thus set forth by the pastoral of the Leinster prelates :—

“ We aim at nothing but to secure the fulfilment of the law of God. Our only purpose is to bring about a more general and more exact observance of the great Christian virtue of temperance ; and, in so far as it may please God to bless our work with so large a measure of success, to root out from amongst our people every vestige of the degrading and soul-destroying vice of drunkenness.”

Let us now particularize the branches of reform essential to this general end. They are three : first, the rescue of the intemperate, and of those who are in immediate danger ; secondly, the preservation of the temperate, especially the children ; and thirdly, the elevation of society in general above the numerous and fatal temptations to intemperance which have become established and deeply rooted by the customs of previous generations.¹ Success on each and all of these three points is necessary for the achievement of our purpose ; and therefore they constitute the true issue, not to be lost sight of throughout our task.

Here attention, serious attention, to the urgency of our case may be requested. This urgency has long been confessed by all, and often expressed in impressive style by the best authorities. Well, it increases up to the present hour. The arrests for drunkenness in 1888 were 87,582 ; in 1889 they were 92,137. The consumption of spirits and beer in 1888-89 was £10,486,330 ; and in 1889-90, £11,381,602. And the cases of drunkenness on Sundays in 1888-89 were 3,395 ; but in 1889-90 they were only a little less, 3,329—although the police in Dublin, and likely in other cities, have been directed to prevent overcrowding the prisons on Saturdays and Sundays, by allowing inebriates to take care of themselves, whom in other circumstances they should arrest. These sad facts, and the sadder inferences to be drawn from them by all who know their consequences to individuals and to families, and who feel at heart for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, are but too fully confirmed

¹ These customs have been set forth in the I. E. RECORD, December, 1889, vol. x., page 1107, &c.

by missionary experience in every part of Ireland. Nowhere are you spared the grief of finding many persons of every class made guilty of many sins and scandals, enslaved by habits of intemperance, and sometimes hurried out of life in appalling circumstances. Let any priest keep a register of the cases of depravity and ruin and untimely deaths resulting exclusively from intemperance which come within his own experience, and he will find his book, as others have found it, being rapidly filled. The question, then, is of the utmost urgency, and if an appeal hereon should be addressed to the readers of the *I. E. RECORD*, it could be neither too forcibly conceived, nor too earnestly expressed. Such an appeal may be borrowed from an address delivered in the Cathedral of St. Paul, United States, by the Most Rev. John Ireland:—

“What is to be done? Anything, O God; but something. I speak to those who by position, influence, talent, or office, ought to take interest in the people. In the name of humanity, of country, of religion; by all the most sacred ties that bind us to our fellow-men; for the love of Him who died for souls, I beseech you, declare war against intemperance; arrest its onward march. If total abstinence does not appear to you the remedy, adopt some other. If you differ from me in the means you propose, I will not complain; but I will complain in the bitterness of my soul, if you stand by, arms folded, while this dreaded torrent is sweeping over the land, carrying with it ruin and misery. The evil, as it exists, is extraordinary—an extraordinary remedy is needed. I hear it said the sacraments of the Church suffice to combat the evil; the Church’s ministrations cannot be supposed to have failed. Who knows better than I the power of the sacraments, the necessity of the Church’s ministrations in all moral reforms? But there is the question of fitting men for the sacraments; of removing the occasion of sin, that the effects of the sacraments remain. God does not dispense in moral efforts with our own energies, and the very history of the Church tells of unusual and extraordinary evils. Those who hold the language I am condemning are doing injury to religion by striving to shield beneath its mantle their own apathy.”

These words are candid, and full of the fearless fortitude of the Baptist; may they prove salutary to us. They are certainly right. St. Paul could declare of himself: “Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is scandalized, and I am

not on fire?"¹ And the great leader of God's people in the olden dispensation, hearing them weeping by their families, every one at the door of his tent, deemed his lot insupportable and complained to the Lord:—

"Why hast Thou afflicted Thy servant? Wherefore do I not find favour before Thee? and why hast Thou laid the weight of all this people upon me? Have I conceived all this multitude, or begotten them, that Thou shouldst say to me: carry them in thy bosom as a nurse is wont to carry the little infant. . . . I am not able alone. . . . But if it seem to Thee otherwise, I beseech Thee to kill me, and let me find grace in Thy eyes, that I be not afflicted with so great evils."²

THE MEANS TO BE ADOPTED.

Understanding the nature of our purpose, and alive to its urgency, we cannot but seek with all earnestness the direct and immediate means of success. As it should be folly for one dangerously ill to hesitate in calling a physician, or to limit his physician in the exercise of his skill: so should we be blamable for the people's ruin and our own were we to fail in seeking the most efficacious remedies, and in adopting those that are at the same time practical. The duty thus implied is set forth with admirable effect by St. Ignatius Loyola in his exercise upon the "Three Classes or Pairs of Men." All three, he supposes, desire a given end. Now the men of the first class rest in the mere desire, and give various excuses for doing nothing. Well, these men are sluggards, "who will, and will not." Their will is not operative, and shall serve but to justify their condemnation. "Out of thy own mouth I judge thee, thou wicked servant." The men of the second class deliberately object to certain means because of personal dislike, although these very means are the surest, or even the only sure means. Such men cannot expect any good measure of success, if they do not, indeed, fail entirely. They sow sparingly, and shall also reap sparingly. Yes, and when, as in our case, spiritual interests are at stake, we are compelled to apply here the denunciations found in sundry places of sacred Scripture; for example:—

"Woe to the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit, and

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 29.

² Numbers xi. 10-15.

see nothing. Thy prophets, O Israel, were like foxes in the deserts. You have not gone up to face the enemy, nor have you set up a wall for the house of Israel, to stand in battle in the day of the Lord . . . Because they have deceived my people, saying: Peace, and there is no peace: and the people built up a wall, and they daubed it with dirt without straw," &c.¹

Then the men of the third class, having "*a great heart and a willing mind*" cast aside all side issues, and, like the merchant seeking precious pearls, sell all they have, and do not count the cost, if only their desire be obtained. These men, if but persevering, infallibly succeed.

St. Ignatius intends this exercise to enable every man of sound reason to gauge the degree of earnestness which actuates him; and, moreover, to excite every man of true spirit to aspire to the highest degree. We must admire his practical skill, and may be expected to embrace the line of action which shall be self-dictated when we shall have applied the above considerations to the end proposed in the Catholic temperance movement. Now this general end embraces the three essential works already determined, and we proceed to inquire what are the surest means by which each of them may be carried on with success.

THE MEANS FOR THE RESCUE OF THE INTEMPERATE AND OF THOSE IN IMMEDIATE DANGER.

The intemperate, and those in danger of becoming intemperate, are numerically legion; socially, belonging to every rank and profession; and, regarding this vice, in various and progressive stages of thralldom, what will cure such persons? Will the easy, generous, and undefined prescriptions of moderation suit: "*not to get drunk*," "*not to drink too much*," "*to stop at what is good for you*," &c.? Is this sufficient? Or, shall we find the remedy in a fixed allowance for each day: not "*two drinks*," which might be made an equivalent for many, but a determined quantity, and, for some cases, at regulated intervals, &c.? No; these remedies have been tried everywhere and among all classes, and for a long time, and never with success. It has been

¹ Ezechiel xiii. 3-10.

under the *régime* of these and similar practices—while the above prescriptions were enforced by the Church and accepted by the people—that intemperance has grown to its actual prevalence and power. True, “sober drinking is health to soul and body,” but here we have to deal with an occasion of sin, with a proximate occasion, and with a proximate occasion of extraordinary and most fatal fascination. As long as any of our strong drinks are taken by persons belonging to the above-named classes so long will they be assaulted by the temptation to drink more and more; so long will they be rendered unfit for prayer; so long will they be kept away from the sacraments, and so long will they be led into the most dangerous occasions of their sin—the place where drink is sold, and the company of the intemperate. Unless in total abstinence, there is practically no chance of deliverance for these persons; and this they themselves feel and confess. Once lately, as often before, a case of this kind was met by the writer. It was that of a man, of genuine Irish faith and spirit, a village tradesman, who, though seldom if ever intoxicated, was a heavy drinker—a typical case. He said:—

“Father, if it were to cost me my life I must give up drink. If I die sober, I’ll be saved; but if I go on drinking, I’ll die through drink, and be damned. I can’t do any good while I am drinking. When I begin, a pint of whiskey is nothing to me in the course of a day, and in the morning I’m out watching for the opening of the public-house. As to my means, I have been at a loss of more than £100 a-year by my drinking.”

No “moderation” pledge has ever rescued such a drunkard in any stage of his sad career—incipient, proficient, or confirmed. Total abstinence is of necessity here; total abstinence all at once, and, if possible, even from the very sight of drink. The sacred Scripture itself prescribes total abstinence for such cases:—

“Challenge not them that love wine, for wine hath destroyed very many;”¹ and “Look not upon wine when it is yellow, when the colour thereof shineth in the glass: it goeth in pleasantly, but in the end it will bite like a snake, and spread abroad poison like a basilisk . . . And thou shalt say . . . when shall I . . . find wine again?”²

¹ Eccli. xxxi. 30.

Prov. xxiii. 31, 35.

Furthermore, the sacred Scripture classes the occasions in question among those which cannot be rendered "remote" by procuring additional grace, because the direct and immediate effect of their action is to hinder the employment of those means by which grace is ordinarily obtained—prayer and the sacraments, with consideration upon the truths of faith. We shall quote a few passages in proof. By the prophet Osee God declares:—"Fornication and wine and drunkenness take away the understanding;"¹ by another prophet we are warned that "wine deceiveth him that drinketh it;"² or, as St. Augustine puts it, "robs him of himself;" and our divine Lord in person has warned us, saying: "Take heed to yourselves, lest perhaps your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness."³ The truth of our proposition, so grave and far-reaching in its practical consequences, particularly in the sacrament of penance, is confirmed by the testimony of the Fathers, and in our own days by moralists of the highest authority. The words of Origen, Augustine, Bernard, and others, on this subject are at hand;⁴ the teaching of moral theologians also;⁵ and the recent pastoral instruction of our own prelates is still ringing in our ears.⁶ Yes, and, with regard to experience, what reader of the I. E. RECORD cannot tell of persons, belonging to the highest as to the lowest classes, who have fallen away while they were weekly or daily communicants, and who have not only failed to improve, but have gone from bad to worse during or immediately after the most extraordinary seasons of grace. In fact, because of the nature of modern drinks, and because of the frequency and quantity of their consumption, our experience outstrips in evil that of former times. Consequently, if we seek to save the sheep lost or endangered by intemperance, we have to induce them to enter the safe refuge of total abstinence, and afterwards to keep them within its barriers.

¹ Osee iv. 2.² Hab. ii. 5.³ Luke xxi. 34.⁴ See *The Discipline of Drink*. By Very Rev. T. E. Bridgett, chaps. i., ii.⁵ See Berardi, *De Occasionariis*, No. 22.⁶ See *Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of Kildare and Leighlin, Ferns and Ossory*, Passion Sunday, 1890, pages 16 and 17.

Here, now, we are face to face with a twofold difficulty. Will the intemperate become total abstainers, and will they persevere in total abstinence? Reason and experience are convincing that they cannot be expected to do either one or the other without the aid of example on the part of those "who have no necessity," and without religious organization. They will admit their failure to keep any other pledge, and their happiness and prosperity while faithful to total abstinence. Theology teaches that although the pledge when broken does not excuse *them* from indirect sin, it considerably lessens the malice of their offence. Science and practice assure them that the habit of drink may be broken off at once with safety to health. Yet they think it "a hard saying," and refuse to be saved. We require then for the rescue of the intemperate the powerful influence of good example on the lines of genuine total abstinence, joined in by all classes, and maintained by religious organization. By these means, although but partially utilized, success most wonderful has been attained; and by the same, if now more generally used and favoured, we may hope for good results. In the days of Oliver Plunket and of Father Mathew, and from Father Mathew's time to the present hour, the leading and teaching and exhortation of the Church never failed to evoke even enthusiasm among the people for total abstinence, and to effect a reformation truly wonderful in individuals and in society. These efforts being only spasmodic, while the counteracting agencies were steadily employing their mighty power, intemperance largely regained its sway. Society as a whole, and individuals for the greater part, were, it may be said, re-entered by the unclean spirit which had been driven out. Yet, how much good was done! how many did keep the pledge! how many still survive to exemplify the advantages of life-long abstinence, and to testify not only to its feasibility but to its extreme facility! From all this the conclusion is, that reason and experience teach that we cannot reform our intemperate brethren without total abstinence associations spread over the whole land; and that these cannot be expected without the zealous, devoted, and patient co-operation of the entire body of the clergy. This is the need of the hour.

But on these points we are met by real difficulties, and by some objections not so real. Regarding both, who will not say, the wonder would be if there were none. "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away." The late Cardinal Newman said, "No one ever proclaimed the truth to a deceived world, but was treated himself as a deceiver." Still, opposition may not be despised, and it is prudent to win over by sincere reasons those who honestly differ from our convictions. Hence we shall seek to secure our position more abundantly by setting forth at length how the seal of truth has been impressed upon our thesis, in all its parts, by him who sits in the chair of truth.

This declaration and instruction of the Holy See regarding total abstinence as a remedy for intemperance are contained in the Brief addressed to the Most Rev. John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul, Minnesota. It is dated March 27th, 1887, and, strangely, was not much spoken of among us till rather lately. The draft of this Brief was prepared by a very high official of Propaganda from a memorandum given by the Pope himself, and when prepared and presented to his Holiness was kept upon his table for consideration during several days. After this the Brief itself was written, signed, and delivered to Dr. Ireland and the Church, as we read it in the I. E. RECORD.¹

The following is a translation of the Brief:—

“(TRANSLATION)

“TO OUR VENERABLE BROTHER, JOHN IRELAND, BISHOP OF ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA, LEO XIII., POPE.

“VENERABLE BROTHER: HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDECTION.

“The admirable works of piety and charity, by which Our faithful children in the United States labour to promote not only their own temporal and eternal welfare, but also that of their fellow-citizens, and which you have recently related to Us, give to Us exceeding great consolation. And, above all, We have rejoiced to learn with what energy and zeal, by means of various excellent associations, and especially through the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, you combat the destructive vice of intemperance. For it is well known to Us how ruinous, how deplorable, is the injury, both to faith and to morals, that is to be feared from

¹ I. E. RECORD, Third series, vol. viii., page 476.

intemperance in drink. Nor can We sufficiently praise the Prelates of the United States who recently in the Plenary Council of Baltimore with weightiest words condemned this abuse, declaring it to be a perpetual incentive to sin, and a fruitful root of all evils, plunging the family of the intemperate into direst ruin, and drawing numberless souls down to everlasting perdition, declaring moreover that the faithful who yield to the vice of intemperance become thereby a scandal to non-Catholics, and a great hindrance to the propagation of the true religion.

“Hence, We esteem worthy of all commendation the noble resolve of your pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it at all be doubted that this determination is a proper and truly efficacious remedy (*opportunum planeque efficax remedium*) for this very great evil; and that so much the more strongly will all be induced to put this bridle upon appetite, by how much the greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example. But greatest of all in this matter should be the zeal of priests, who, as they are called to instruct the people in the word of life, and to mould them to Christian morality, should also, and above all, walk before them in the practice of virtue. Let pastors, therefore, do their best to drive the plague of intemperance from the fold of Christ, by assiduous preaching and exhortation, and to shine before all as models of abstinence, that so the many calamities with which this vice threatens both Church and State may, by their strenuous endeavours, be averted.

“And We most earnestly beseech Almighty God that, in this important matter, He may graciously favour your desires, direct your counsels, and assist your endeavours; and as a pledge of the Divine protection, and a testimony of Our paternal affection, We most lovingly bestow upon you, venerable brother, and upon all your associates in this holy League, the Apostolic benediction.

“Given at Rome, from St. Peter’s, this 27th day of March, in the year 1887, the tenth year of Our Pontificate.

“LEO XIII., POPE.”

Now what does His Holiness declare and teach concerning our present question? It is found in the second paragraph, and the sense of these words of weight may be expressed in the following propositions:—1. *A proper and truly efficacious remedy* (“*opportunum planeque efficax remedium*”) *for the very great evil of intemperance is the noble resolve of your pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain totally from every kind of intoxicating drink.* 2. *The efficacy*

of this remedy will be increased in proportion to the dignity and influence of those who give the example, and it shall be greatest when priests will, in conformity with their vocation, shine before all as models of abstinence. Upon some words and phrases of this part of the papal Brief have been raised questions which need not be discussed, because their bearing upon the true issue is not decisive. The whole context needs to be considered, and, in this light the readers will see that the Pope speaks herein as the teacher of all, and that he determines the remedy to be applied to intemperance wherever it has assumed the proportions of a great social evil. His instruction is not restricted to the means, which, if applied, will be efficacious in curing a drunkard, but extends to every phase of intemperance, and provides a remedy for society. He is not, it may be said, fishing for individuals, as with a single hook; but for multitudes, as with a net let down in the open sea.

To adduce additional authorities, in confirmation of what we have ventured to put forward, should be disrespectful alike to the readers of the I. E. RECORD and to the Holy Father, "*Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*" But our eyes must not be closed nor our ears shut to the difficulties and contrary opinions among us regarding total abstinence as the only sure means of rescue for the intemperate and for all in danger of intemperance. As to difficulties, there is but one, and, if it needs to be named in these pages, it is the difficulty of securing a duly zealous and unanimous effort on our own part. This is the key of the situation. We shall try to submit some arguments and facts to the purpose when our position shall have been strengthened yet further by what has to be written upon the second and third essential parts of the temperance reformation. Together with this difficulty we shall remit such objections as relate to the whole question *e.g.*, that total abstinence, as a social practice, is impossible or inadvisable, &c. Just now it seems best to confine our attention to what is objected by persons of position and influence against the proposition that a general organization of all classes in total abstinence associations is at present necessary for the rescue of the victims of intemperance.

This necessity is not admitted, and alternative remedies are proposed :—

1. The reception of the sacraments, without any pledge.
2. A partial or temporary pledge to be administered to children and to intemperate persons alone.
3. The improvement of the homes and of the general conditions of life among our people.
4. The ostracizing of the intemperate; the re-introduction of the public stocks; and the rigid infliction of legal chastisement.

5. Further restrictions by law of the licensed sale of drink, and greater fidelity to duty on the part of magistrates and police.

Our reply to these grounds of objection shall be both general and particular.

(a) In general it cannot be denied that all these foregoing and other similar remedies are good, and the greater our efforts in applying them, the greater will be the gain. But we have been looking to them for our cure now more than three centuries, and have not obtained it. No; but we are worse, and still, in many respects at least, sinking.

*Aetas majorum, pejor avis, tulit nos nequiores,
Mox laturos progeniem vitiosiore.*

Our remedy, then, does not lie in these prescriptions only. They are certainly insufficient for our need; and, besides, are often more difficult than the proper and efficacious remedy.

(b) Taking each alternative singly we can easily detect why each has failed.

1. It has been explained and proved above that the practices of religion are not to be expected from the intemperate so long as they continue to drink. Here it may well be claimed that the total abstinence pledge is essentially and eminently a practice of religion. In many of the cases under consideration it is identical with that purpose of amendment which is required for the pardon of sin; and in all it is blessed by the Church and enriched with indulgences,

2. We have previously shown¹ that pledges confined to the intemperate and children, by Drs. Leahy and Furlong, did not cope with the evil. All know that the intemperate alone will hardly take or keep a pledge; and we hope to satisfy the readers, in a future issue, that the pledges of children are generally and quickly broken, when unprotected and unsupported by the example and counsel of parents and others.

3. As to the remedy to be found in increased domestic comfort and general prosperity, there is much to be said. Summarizing the chief truths and facts, we submit that the victims of intemperance are numerous among *all* classes; that the immediate consequence of intemperance is the ruin of all domestic virtues, and a prodigal waste of means; and that our would-be happiest homes are made miserable by the intemperance of even one member of the family. What, then, of "the needy and the poor"? Thus we have misspent much more than £100,000,000 in buying beer and spirits alone during the last decade of our lives. As much again, *at least*, must be put down for the losses and indirect expenditure entailed by drink. These sums added together would well pay all our rents, relieve all our poor, endow all our schools, support many useful manufactories, and provide for our sick and afflicted brethren. Instead, however, of so applying our money we madly use it in what leaves to many almost nothing but misery and sin. Can we then earnestly think of promoting domestic comfort and social prosperity without seeking to stop this outlay as a first step?

4. Next it is said: stigmatize the drunkard; imprison him; put him in the stocks. But can the Christian priesthood counsel such things, and limit efforts to such counsel? Is it by such means that "other Christs" are to seek the glory of God and the salvation of souls? Shame is, indeed, cogent in urging us to self-correction, and should be utilized prudently. But this very thing will be best secured by organizing all classes of good people for the purpose of

¹ I. E. RECORD, vol. x., pages 632-635.

practising temperance "in its highest and most exemplary form," and so revealing the abominations and crimes of intemperance by the brightness of the opposing light of good example. Whenever this organization shall become fairly general our people will be disposed to hear the teaching of the Apostle: "If any man that is named a brother be . . . a drunkard: . . . with such an one, not so much as to eat."¹

At present they are not prepared. The sympathy of fellowship in the habits and customs which lead too many to excess renders all either unfit or unwilling to condemn the drunkard as he deserves. To very many of all classes might be quoted the words: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone."²

5. It is the plain duty of a government to promote the common good by legislation. It is a responsible trust to magistrates to administer just and equitable laws with fidelity "without fear, favour, or affection." More might be added. But legislation apart from the will of the people is not worth a thought from us as a remedy for intemperance. It is hardly possible; it must be ineffectual. First apply welcome and direct agencies to public opinion. Excite reasonable enthusiasm; or, in other words, practical earnestness among the people for the suppression of this acknowledged evil. Then legislation will contribute its powerful aid, and must greatly help to success and permanent improvement.

The present essay cannot now be extended to comprise the other two essential parts of our work, but they shall gladly be taken up in the next number of the I. E. RECORD, with the editor's kind permission. Meanwhile the nature of our work and its ultimate end must urge us to seek by prayer the much required aid of divine grace. "Unless the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it." In this respect there are two easy practices from which much good should follow—a daily memento at Mass, Office, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, and Rosary; and a request to penitents and others, especially children, to pray for the success of the Catholic temperance movement.

MICHAEL KELLY, M.SS.

¹ 1 Cor. v. 11.

² John viii. 7

PRIESTS AND POLITICS:

MAY PRIESTS SHOW AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND MATERIAL WELFARE OF THEIR FLOCKS.

“Sancta atque inviolata apud omnes debet esse religio : imo in ipsa disciplina civitatum, quae a legibus morum officiisque religionis separari non potest, hoc est potissimum perpetuoque spectandum, quid maxime expediat Christiano nomini.”

LEO, PP. XIII.

“L’hérésie du siècle, c’est la séparation ; on veut séparer l’Eglise de l’Etat ; les prêtres, du peuple. Un mot barbare caractérise la situation : il faut tout *laïciser* ! On prétend enfermer le prêtre dans le sanctuaire. Le Pape est prisonnier au Vatican ; tous les prêtres le sont aussi relegués dans la sacristie : on ne veut pas qu’ils sortent du temple parce qu’ils iraient conquérir les âmes !” (From a speech of Rev. P. Ludovic de Besse, O.S.F., at the *Congrès de Liège*, 1890.)

THAT a priest has a distinct right, under certain conditions, to take part in politics, and to discuss social, philanthropical, and other public questions, is perfectly clear. Nevertheless, it is equally clear that a very strong feeling exists in many quarters against his exercising this right. The real reason of this feeling is generally lost sight of. It is so easy and so convenient to ascribe it to nothing more nor less than to the natural and *prima facie* incongruity which must always be felt to exist between the peaceful character of a minister of the Gospel, the healer of wounds, and the redressor of wrongs, on the one hand, and the wrangling and fighting, the angry words and dissonant language on the other ; which, though it need not, yet, as a fact, generally does accompany the heated discussions of all questions which are of a very strong and of a very widespread interest.

A more careful consideration of the subject, however, will probably lead to a modification of this view, and convince us that, whatever dexterous use may be made of the “incongruity” argument, the genuine cause of the hostility must be traced to a much less honourable source. Men,

especially men in authority, are jealous of a priest's power, and resent the influence he exercises over the masses. They note that this influence is very considerable; that his very position gives him a great, and in their eyes an unfair advantage; and that he is not merely one individual pitted against another in equal combat, which they would not so much resent, but that he is a man invested with extraordinary powers, and enjoying very special opportunities to which an ordinary layman can lay no claim. His very position is one of distinction; and the people are accustomed to receive the law from his lips. The priest is the duly accredited teacher and instructor of men, and the appointed interpreter of the divine will. In spiritual matters his voice is preferred before the voice of kings and governors; and he is obeyed rather than they, because, *ex officio*, at least, he does but expound the law of God; and "we must obey God rather than man."

For numberless generations the people have looked to the priest for direction, for counsel, and for encouragement. He has always proved himself their friend. He has stood by them in danger, has defended them from oppression, has openly rebuked their persecutors, and when he could not actually free his people, he, at least, shared their sorrows and their trials, and bore the heavier penalties of tyrannous governments in penal times, when confiscation, imprisonment, and even death, were the rewards of fidelity to the Catholic cause. The masses, through centuries of oppression, have learned to confide in the priest; long years of generous helpful sympathy, on the one side, and filial fire-tried confidence on the other, have welded pastor and people together by a thousand ties not easily broken; and each feels stronger in the support and sympathy of the other.

The consequence of all this is, that even at the present day, when persecution has ceased, and the rack no longer grates on its hinges, and the axe of the executioner lies a rusty relic in the Tower, the bulk of the people are still more ready to listen to the priest than to anyone else. They have inherited something of the enthusiasm that stimulated their forefathers in bygone ages, and still feel a

greater sense of security in following his advice than that of the most respectable and well-spoken layman in the country, because of their greater trust in the genuineness of his professions of interest in them.

It is not surprising, then, that a priest, in whom the faithful are accustomed to see the representative of the highest authority on earth or in heaven, should wield a degree of influence which looks unfair and out of all proportion to the very modest claim upon which he presumes to record his vote at the elections; viz., as a citizen who pays taxes and has a stake in the country. Nor is it surprising that he should often become an object of suspicion and jealousy to such as have reason to stand in fear of his opposition.

It may, of course, be freely admitted, that the multitude are little accustomed to delicate discernment or to the balancing of claims. They have never been taught to weigh and compare with any degree of nicety the various titles which the same person may have to their allegiance, or by which he may endeavour to influence their conduct. They have been accustomed to have their moral duties and spiritual obligations defined by the minister of God, and they have been taught that his lips shall guard wisdom. The voice that bids them attend Mass on Sundays, to fast in Lent, and to confess at Easter, is the same that may be heard soliciting their vote for a particular parliamentary candidate; and in the man who denounces a certain political measure from the hustings they may recognise the same Father X. or Y. who condemns drunkenness or theft in the parish church on the Sunday mornings. Hence, though it would not be at all true to say that the multitude deem the political speech of equal authority to the moral sermon, yet, the speech being uttered by the same man, and perhaps even with greater vehemence, may possibly acquire by the mere force of circumstances and associations—not indeed an authority—but *an air of* authority much beyond that which would attach to the selfsame words if uttered by a non-clerical opponent who stands outside the halo of these associations. But this we mention merely to show that the fact has not been forgotten.

The priest's right to take part in politics and other matters affecting the general welfare of his country has been so much decried, misrepresented, misunderstood, and even caricatured, that it may not be unprofitable to make an attempt to clear the atmosphere a little by stating the general principles, leaving those in authority to guide and counsel us in the more delicate matter of their practical application.¹

1. POLITICS INVOLVING CONSIDERATIONS OF FAITH OR MORALS.

The priest, as the minister of God, is, of course, in his proper sphere when dealing with matters concerning religion and the service of his Divine Master. He has a right, in the strictest sense of the word, to resist, and to urge others to resist, any political enactment inconsistent with the laws of God. When unscrupulous men rise into power, and abuse their authority, and trample on the rights of the Church, or on liberty of conscience, we may denounce such acts with all the eloquence at our command, and fearlessly condemn them with the frankness and the independence of an apostle. Had the clergy in England, in the time of the great schism—miscalled the Reformation—possessed a little more of that temper; had they shown a little more zeal in repelling execrable laws, and in stirring up their flocks to resist unlawful encroachments and aggression, perhaps we would not now be left to deplore with scalding tears of blood the spiritual desolation and religious ruin of what once promised to be the greatest

¹ As nothing is so easy as to confuse similar though totally different questions, and as all confusion is apt to lead to disagreement and strained relations, sometimes even developing into the use of abusive language instead of argument, we shall do well to remember that a distinction is to be observed—first, between (*a*) politics, pure and simple, in which no question of faith or morals is involved, and (*b*) politics involving questions of religion; secondly, between (*c*) a priest acting as a representative of the Church, and (*d*) a priest acting in his own private capacity, and as a simple citizen; and lastly, between (*e*) the right to take part in politics, and (*f*) the prudence or advisability of taking any such part. By refusing to observe these distinctions, absurd and erroneous propositions are laid down, and the most outrageous assertions stoutly and stubbornly maintained with a vigour often as excessive as it is ridiculous.

missionary country in the world. Had the majority of the clergy but followed the example of the small minority; had they imitated Bishop Fisher and his small but noble band of followers in their heroic resistance, instead of basely yielding, and trimming, and flattering the royal tyrant, whose very presence was pollution, we might still be hearing High Mass in Westminster Abbey, and watching the long procession of black-robed monks wending its way through the gorgeous Gothic aisles, amidst the swinging of censers, and the swelling of anthems through the fretted vault.

In Germany, priests are still living who have resisted the laws of the land for the sake of their faith, and who have suffered fines and imprisonment in consequence: pastors whose heroism we can refer to only in terms of the profoundest admiration and respect. Even here in England, at the present day, we are not unfrequently called upon to oppose measures hostile to the full and free discharge of our duty to God, though happily neither torture nor death now threatens us. Legal enactments concerning education, concerning marriage, concerning divorce, and so forth, have come into operation, and may do so again in the future, and a priest is undoubtedly at liberty to speak of and to explain such laws in so far as they affect faith or morality. For example: though the civil law grants a divorce, and permits unhappy couples to separate and to contract other unions, the pastor from the very fulness of his authority may denounce such a law from the pulpit of his church, and declare, on the word of God himself, that the second marriage is null and void, and nothing more than a legalized concubinage, and the consenting parties guilty of an atrocious sin before God, and that all the civil governments in the world, with all their laws, are as powerless to efface or erase the original bond of union, as to put out the sun at noonday by fanning it with a peacock's feather.

If a priest may so act when the government defies and tramples on the Catholic law of marriage, he may, of course, act in a similar manner when any other measure inconsistent with dogmatic truth is before the legislature. Such a part in politics, if so indeed it can be styled, is beyond a shadow

of doubt within the strict right of a priest, even when considered in his official capacity as a minister of the Gospel. But this is too obviously true to need any further proof or illustration. Let us then turn without further preamble to the very much more difficult and vexed question, as to a priest's right to take part in political and social movements, as such.

It has been urged that "a priest ought not to enter into a purely secular political sphere." This declaration, worded with all the glorious ambiguity that oracles are wont to affect, cannot be answered off-hand and without making a distinction. A priest, as such, that is to say, while speaking in the name and with the authority of the Church; *concedo*. A priest in his private capacity, and speaking simply in his own name; *subdistinguo*. If by "ought not," means "has no right;" *nego sententiam*. If by the expression "ought not," is meant nothing more than "it would be more prudent, charitable, considerate, or advisable" not to enter into a purely secular sphere, we can but reply—*transeat*, at least for the present.

2. A PRIEST, AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

When we have proclaimed a priest's right to take part in politics, officially, and as a minister of the Gospel, so often as his interference be needed for the defence of Catholic faith or morals, we have not exhausted his rights. He has rights irrespective of his ecclesiastical position. He was a citizen before he was a priest, and a member of the commonwealth before he became a member of the *Ecclesia docens*; and he possesses civil rights and privileges just as truly as any other man. Nor does the imposition of hands diminish or destroy one jot or tittle of such rights, any more than the wearing of a cassock blunts his natural affections or extinguishes his love of home and country. St. Paul himself asserted his rights as a civilian, and boasted that he was "a citizen of no mean city" (Acts xxi. 32). He appealed to Cæsar (xxv. 11), and as a Roman he claimed the privilege of dying by the sword rather than by crucifixion or strangulation. So, too, we priests are free to make similar claims,

and we calmly but firmly resent the officious and impertinent interference of those who seem to think that to become an ecclesiastic is to abdicate all civil rights and privileges, and who argue as though we were incapable of having any personal views, opinions, or interests but such as are purely supernatural.

What! have sacred orders destroyed our manhood? Have they crushed out of us all interest in the welfare of home and fatherland? Are such the fruits of the sacrament? God forbid! While others are exerting themselves to promote the interests of their native country; while laymen strive, and struggle, and bleed, are we alone of all men to stand aside and rest indifferent and unconcerned, and shut ourselves up in our shells, as the unconscious limpet, so soon as the storm and the tempest sweep around? Is the work of a priest so exclusively religious that he must have no thought of the temporal well-being of his flock? If a measure of relief is proposed; if an effort is being made to reduce the hours of hard labour to eight per diem; or to do away with the sweating system; or to give East End tailors equitable wages, is he to give no advice, to make no representation, to utter no word, because, forsooth, it does not immediately concern the service of the altar?¹

Surely, the heart of a priest, should be large enough to embrace both spiritual and temporal spheres! If he loves his people with the heart of a father, he loves them in the broadest sense of the term: he wishes them *every* good, not alone those which are spiritual, and will try to promote both their temporal and their eternal interests, according to the measure of his opportunities and capacity, with all patience and prudence. Because he clearly recognises that the spiritual is infinitely more valuable than the material; because he knows with absolute certainty that *eternal* happiness is in every respect incomparably more necessary than any temporal

¹ This active interest of ecclesiastics in a people's welfare has been manifest from the earliest times in England. Those who speak of this "*modern nineteenth century*" practice, should recall the ages when Archbishop Stephen Langton championed the old English customs and laws against the personal despotism of King John; when Anselm withstood King William, and Theobald King Stephen, &c.

happiness whatsoever ; that is no reason why the actual and immediate prosperity and well-being of his flock should be wholly ignored, or left exclusively to the pity of others.

Are the corporal works of mercy to find no place on the priest's escutcheon ? or is he to seek to relieve the poor and the oppressed only by building them a hospital or proffering them a crust ? May he not also, if he gets the opportunity, throw all the weight of his influence in with those who are struggling hard to get some substantial measure of reform passed through the Houses of Parliament ? May he not give countenance to the agitation, and encourage, both by word and example, the noble-hearted and generous efforts that are being made to ease this or that enactment which presses too heavily and sorely on the masses ? Surely, a priest, living in the midst of his people, knowing them by name, labouring for them, praying for them, loving them, should be the last of all to show indifference to what concerns their welfare. He cannot forget that they have bodies as well as souls ; and that these bodies must be cared for ; and that men cannot even live, much less thrive, in *this* world on the bare anticipation of the *next*, however beautiful and however magnificent it may be. The true pastor, therefore, watches, and hopes, and helps, and prays, and exerts all his influence to further and to foster the prosperity of his country and the welfare of his flock.¹

Such zeal is undoubtedly good and admirable ; but it must, of course, be accompanied with discretion and exercised with consummate prudence. To say that it is hard and perilous to tread the slippery ground of politics : to say that it is easy to enter with the best of motives and the purest of intentions, and yet difficult not to be drawn a step too far in one direction or another, or to commit an indiscretion, or to be carried away by precipitancy, strength of feeling, or false confidence, is to say what most men will readily acknowledge, and what history is constantly engaged in proving.

¹ Si tous les prêtres comprenaient ce devoir, si le peuple comprenait que le prêtre peut l'aider à atteindre par les moyens honnêtes le bien être d'ici-bas, comme le bien éternel ; éclairés, secouant leurs préjugés, ils se tourneraient vers le Pape. (Père L. de Besse, O.S.F.)

But then we must bear in mind "*humanum est errare*"—everything human is liable to error. Why, the courts of justice themselves should be done away with, if nothing that ever fails in its purpose may be suffered to stand. There have been inhuman judges, and packed juries, and perjured witnesses, and unjust sentences; and men have, before now, been launched into eternity for crimes that they have never committed. Yet, the judge still goes on circuit; and the counsel still pleads; and men are still hanged—and no one is foolish enough to remonstrate or complain.

What has always been to us a subject of such surprise is, that while so much has been said of the "*mischief*" that priests have done in secular spheres; of the "*disasters*," the "*scandals*," and the "*evils*" to which they have given rise, so little has been said of the good done, the scandals prevented, the wrongs redressed, the angry passions calmed, the evils diminished, the wounds healed, the tears dried, and the hearts comforted by the person of the priest—especially among a devoted and religious people like the Irish.

Men are by no means so unfair when judging of other professions and walks of life. Though doctors and physicians have been known before now to abuse their power, and to prostitute their knowledge and skill to evil purposes, no one argues that men should therefore renounce the study of medicine, or that surgeons should henceforth cease to hack and saw. No; the world recognises the substantial good done, and the many signal services rendered by the faculty, and is content to let pass the blundering of one individual or the awkwardness of another; nor deems it generous to point the reproachful finger of scorn at incidental slips and failures, the mere concomitants of an otherwise unremitting beneficence.

Far otherwise with the priest. Let him but once outstrip the measure of strict prudence by a hair's breadth; let him in his zeal and earnestness commit but a single indiscretion, and at once this act is fastened on, magnified, distorted and denounced in every note and key, and whispered around from one to another as a fair specimen of all the rest.

Then again the cry rises: "no priests in secular affairs;" "no ecclesiastical interference;" "no dictation by the clergy," and so forth. Because Canon X or Father Y, in such a place, and on such an occasion, used unguarded language, uttered unkind threats, or denounced a man from the altar, the whole system is reprobated and condemned. There is no sense of the proportion of things. The widest and most universal conclusions are drawn from the narrowest premisses, and even from single acts of individuals—acts of which none approve, and which none defend; or from the conduct of isolated priests who are neither representatives of the clergy in general, nor the responsible exponents of their views and opinions.

May the day be far distant, say we, when we English-speaking priests shall cease to care for the social, political, and material prosperity of our flocks, or in which we shall pay any attention to those who ask us to withdraw from such spheres as from forbidden ground. To keep rigidly within the sanctuary rails; to be deaf to all but strictly spiritual clamours; to be blind to all but distinctly spiritual sufferings, and to show no interest in anything that concerns this terrestrial life, would be a most disastrous and regrettable policy. May the day never dawn when the relations between priest and people shall become strained and unnatural, and his duties towards them restricted to the mere distribution of sacraments and the imparting of benedictions. Lamentable, indeed, would be the result.

Look at France at the present day! Her clergy are excellent, and models of sacerdotal virtue; they are learned in scholastic theology, and perhaps, as a class, the best preachers in the world. Yet what is their influence over the people? What is their real power over the millions of labourers, artisans, mechanics and apprentices? It is exceedingly slight; in fact, hardly appreciable. And why is this, but because the French clergy have become too much of a caste: because they have stood aloof, and have refused to enter into the legitimate views of the people; to encourage their lawful aspirations, to show a personal interest in their worldly and temporal prosperity; and because they have left them to

fight their own battles with state, commune, and municipality; and have replied to all their invitations by a shrug of the shoulders and a “*qu’est ce que cela me fait à moi*”? practically declaring that it has nothing to do with the clergy how their earthly affairs were managed, or indeed whether they were managed at all. And so, because no practical assistance nor advice was to be obtained from the priests, their natural counsellors, they became a law to themselves; and any self-made and self-chosen demagogue, any rowdy blustering rodomontade in whom the pent-up public feeling might find utterance, was listened to and applauded. And further, and ever further apart, drifted priest and people as years rolled on, until the French clergy of the present day are left stranded high and dry like anchored ships, when the sea has retired and the tide has gone out. In France, in these days a priest’s overtures would, in fact, scarcely be listened to or considered, so wholly unaccustomed have the people grown to anything of the kind.¹

A French *curé* cannot inspire either the confidence, or the love, or even the respect and veneration that an Irish priest inspires in the great masses. The poor and labouring classes of Ireland, for instance, feel that they have in the priest a father, a friend, and a brother, all in one—one upon whom, not only their spiritual difficulties and trials, but their temporal sufferings fall with the certainty of awakening a sympathetic response, and who will help them to the utmost of his ability.

This is not because the Irish priest fails in the sterner part of his duty. No! Who, indeed, can chide and upbraid his people, when necessary, as an Irish parish priest? Though he may press his scathing words upon them with a vigour and a boldness which few others would venture to emulate, yet, it must be admitted that his admonitions are received with the utmost respect and good feeling; a fact explicable only on the ground that the members of the flock know that their pastor really loves them, and is actuated only by a strong desire for their good, and because

¹ If another instance be desired, we may turn to Italy.

a passing outbreak of virtuous indignation or impassioned reproach is quite incapable of shaking a confidence which is grounded, not on this or that particular circumstance, but upon the consistent and sustained struggle for their good which characterizes his entire life.

3. PRUDENCE NECESSARY.

That acts of indiscretion have been committed, and that we priests have sometimes overstepped the bounds of prudence, is perfectly true, but really means very little. Indeed, it is simply to affirm that priests are men and not angels, and that they have not received the gift of impeccability. Still it must be allowed that, as a class, at least, we know our duty, and are fully aware that our right to take part in politics is not absolute, and can be exercised only under certain conditions and limitations; further, that what is lawful is not always expedient; and that many an act perfectly legitimate in itself must be renounced for the sake of a yet higher good.

While, therefore, we claim liberty (which so many of the laity would deny us) of taking part in politics, we are quite ready to admit that we lie under a most serious obligation of taking heed, lest, as St. Paul writes, "this liberty become a stumbling-block to the weak." The claim we advance is a just and a fair one. It is in itself a good thing, *res bona*; but, of course, to exercise even a right without any regard to its consequences, and still more with a clear foreknowledge that it will produce serious spiritual injury, is to convert a "right" into a "wrong": it is to use a good thing in a bad way, "*re bona male uti*."

After all is said and done, the unalterable truth remains. Charity, edification, and peace of conscience, are ever to be preferred before any purely temporal interests and advantages whatsoever: a truth beautifully illustrated and exemplified in the teaching and the conduct of the great apostle to the Gentiles, who assured the Corinthians that even though such an innocent practice as that of eating meat should scandalize his brother, he would never eat meat, lest it should scandalize him (1 Cor. viii.). "If," argues

the angel of the schools, commenting on this passage, "if a man should abstain from almost the necessities of life (*quasi a necessariis vite*) rather than give scandal, with how much greater reason should he abstain from what is not necessary, and this, not because of any intrinsic unlawfulness or injustice in the act itself, but solely 'lest I scandalize my brother.'"

4. PHARISAICAL SCANDAL.

While listening to the inspired words of the great apostle, however, we must be upon our guard lest we confuse the scandal here spoken of (*scandalum pusillorum*) with an entirely different form of scandal (*scandalum pharisaeorum*), which is as detestable as it is inexcusable, and deserving of nothing but contempt and disdain—we mean pharisaical scandal—the scandal not given, but taken. Such scandal should not be allowed to interfere with the discharge of duty, or to hamper us in the exercise of good works. Such scandal was occasioned—not caused—again and again, even by our Lord Himself; yet He calmly held on the even tenor of His way untroubled and unaffected. He scandalized the highly sensitive Pharisees; but He did so without pity, and only reproached them for their hypocrisy. He scandalized them because He cured diseases on the Sabbath day; because He refused to chide His disciples as they plucked the ears of corn; because He conversed with sinners; eat meat with publicans, and declined to condemn the woman taken in adultery. Christ did not desist by reason of such consequences: neither should we: if we allow ourselves to be checked and impeded at every turn for fear of modern Pharisees (whose name is Legion) we shall not merely be departing from the lines laid down by our divine Model, but we shall prove ourselves but poor and inefficient labourers in the vineyard of the Church, and unworthy of the grave charge that has been laid upon our shoulders.

How far exactly it is prudent in practice for us priests to mix ourselves up in political and social movements, even when we have fair hopes of doing good, and where precisely we should draw the line beyond which it would be unsafe to go, is one of those delicate and perplexing questions, which it would ill become me to attempt to decide—it depends, in such a great

measure, upon the character, training, and ability of the individual priest; upon the political unanimity of the flock committed to his charge, and upon a thousand other circumstances and conditions connected with the state of mind and feeling prevalent in the locality—circumstances and conditions which must vary almost indefinitely, and of which those at a distance can judge scarcely at all, unless possibly a layman here or there, who suddenly develops a vocation to lecture the clergy.

Fortunately we have our legitimate spiritual superiors to whom we can look for guidance in all these matters; and, of course, the exercise of the right we have been maintaining must be largely controlled and directed by them. There does not appear to be perfect unity of practice on these points, even if we confine our examination to the dioceses in England. An enactment in the Shrewsbury diocese runs as follows:—"We prohibit all public action of our clergy, whether on platforms or by writing, in the strife of party politics, unless where a distinctively Catholic question, such as the defence of schools, calls for our united action." From this it appears that his Lordship of Shrewsbury considers the circumstances of his diocese do not warrant the latitude allowed by other bishops. Thus, a regulation that seems good to the Angel of Shrewsbury is thought inexpedient, or at least unnecessary, by his spiritual brother ruling over an adjacent see. Who will say which bishop is right, and which is wrong? For our part, we would not dare to say that either is wrong. On the contrary, we would far rather believe that both are right; for each is concerned about his own little plot in the one world-wide vineyard. And may not circumstances alter cases? May not the vines growing upon one kind of soil need a different dressing and cultivation to those growing on another? Surely, so far from complaining at such regulations and enactments as superiors are inspired to make, we should deem it no small privilege to possess an authoritative voice to decide these difficult questions, and should rejoice in the security afforded by a prompt and unquestioning submission to an authority which by every right and title we are bound to recognise and respect.

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND, FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE PRESENT.¹

THE field of native Church history is comparatively so derelict that one is disposed to admit a new worker without question. Moreover, on looking this volume through, references are found calculated to disarm hostile criticism on my part. A few years ago, for instance, I was at some pains, in the I. E. RECORD, to prove that St. Columbanus did not die on November 21st, the date commonly received, but on the 23rd. Here (page 156) I am duly credited with having made good my thesis. Apart, however, from considerations of the kind, I may be permitted to express appreciation of the spirit which prompted the very reverend author to devote his time to the prosecution of studies well-nigh totally neglected by those most immediately concerned.

The work, as far as the present instalment extends, will be found to be a compilation made from material accessible in print. Accordingly, it makes no addition to previous information. On the other hand, by comparison with similar works on the subject, it may be allowed to be fairly comprehensive and tolerably accurate. In view, however, of the attempt made in some quarters to assign the volume a place in history equal to that occupied by the *Grammatica Celtica* in philology, it becomes necessary, in the interest of historical research, to show that, chiefly with regard to the ancient Church, the book labours under serious omissions and grave errors of fact.

First, respecting completeness. One of the most difficult questions connected with our hagiology is that of the *Cursus*, or Divine Office. What did it consist of? what were the "traditional varieties" alluded to by St. Columbanus in the chapter (vii.) *De Synaxi seu de Cursu Psalmorum*, of his

¹ *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland von der Einführung des Christenthums bis auf die Gegenwart.* Von Alphons Bellesheim, Doctor der Theologie und beider Rechte, Canonikus des Collegiatstifts in Aachen. Erster Band, von 432 bis 1509. Mainz, 1890.

rule; what change was affected therein by the Youghal saint, Cuaran of the Wisdom, that got him the name of "the None"? These are radical queries which no one that works at first hand can afford to pass over. In addition, the author lives within easy reach of the requisite original data. But, I regret to state, the sole treatment accorded them here is the stale and refuted assertion (page 597) that the *Cursus Scottorum* signified the Liturgy, that is, the Mass.

Connected herewith, the following is given by Schepps ("The oldest Gospel MSS. of the Würzburg University Library," page 27) from a MS.: "Mosinu Maccumin, scriba et abbas Benn cuir, primus Hebernensium compotem [computum] a Greco quodam sapiente memorialiter didicit. Deinde Mocuoros Maccumin Semon, quem Romani doctorem totius mundi nominabant alumnusque præfati scribae, in insola quae dicitur Crannach Duinlethglaise hanc scientiam literis fixit, ne memoria laberetur."

The remarkable allegations of the preceding extract are not mentioned, although the work of Schepps is given in the index of authors.

The decay of the Columban monastic rule on the Continent is attributed (page 159) to two causes, one being the frequent recurrence of the lash in the Penitential of St. Columbanus. But the author seems unaware that the longer recension, first published as chapter x. of the *Regula Coenobialis*, by Holsten, is (to keep within firm ground) demonstrably interpolated. Here, again, he had at hand the material required for investigating the extent of the forgery.

In treating of the Irish foundations of Würzburg, no allusion is made to the interesting statements of Clement V. respecting the Monastery of St. James "extra muros: Verum, licet monasterium ipsum de antiqua et approbata consuetudine quosvis religiosos ordinis cuiuscumque, dummodo de Ibernia oriundi, seu veri Ibernici fuerint, recipere teneatur," &c. (Theiner, *Vet. Mon.*, page 182).

In the chapter on Irish Art (page 669), glass chalices are mentioned, and a description of a stone chalice is given. But of the Ardagh chalice—as great a marvel in its way as the Tara brooch—not a word. Though he sets down *Trans-*

actions of the Royal Irish Academy from 1787, the compiler apparently failed to see the paper of the Earl of Dunraven (*Antiq.*, vol. xxiv., part ix.), published as far back as 1874.

The execution next demands notice. A compilation such as the present, to be of value, should contain working references and statements taken directly from the sources indicated. Prefixed is a list of close upon two hundred and fifty works dealing with the subject-matters. How far they were directly availed of, a few examples will show. "Mabillon, Joh.: *Musaeum Italicum*, Paris, 1687." The Bobbio Missal, we learn (page 595), all the same, was published by Mabillon in the *Musaeum*, in 1724. The explanation is, that the information has been copied without acknowledgment from Moran's *Essays*, page 276. But, unfortunately, John Mabillon lay seventeen years dead in 1724. "O'Connor, *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores Veteres: 1. Tigernachi Annales, &c.*" Of Tigernach, the Canon tells us (page 642), amongst other things, that "in his chronology, beginning with the Incarnation, he shows himself conversant with all the means of correcting the Kalendar. He knew the Lunar Cycle, and used the Dominical Letters; on the other hand, the Solar Cycle of Nineteen years, and the Golden Number were unknown to him."

Well, the only printed edition of Tigernach is still that of O'Connor. The volume in question lies open before me. Here is what is found therein with respect to the foregoing. (1) He begins with the reign of Ptolomey (Lagus), which O'Connor marks in the margin B.C. 305. (2) There are no "means of correcting the Kalendar." Truth to tell, I do not know what is meant. (3) He, as far as I can learn, did not know the Lunar Cycle. But the Cycle of Nineteen, which is quite a different thing, and which perhaps is intended, he knew well; for he mentions that our Lord was born in the second year of the Decemnovennial Cycle (page 12). (4) Neither Tigernach, nor any of the older annalists, used Dominical Letters. I wish they had. They, as well as Bede, employed Ferial Numbers. (5) The Solar Cycle of Nineteen is, of course, an oversight for that of Twenty-eight. The latter, Tigernach was naturally

acquainted with. Here, for once, O'Connor happens to be right: "Cyclum Solarem non semel memoratum invenio" (page 21).

The solution of the foregoing discrepancies is supplied by the fact that the assertions regarding Tigernach were taken from O'Curry's *Lectures* (page 61). One error (5) is amusing. O'Curry's informant took *non semel* to signify *not even once*, instead of *not once, but often*.

In reference to the literature of the Ancient Church, the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*, it is suggested (page 191-192) was drawn up by command of the Fathers of a Synod in Tara, in 697. But the compilers, the time and the place of the Collection, have been discovered to the satisfaction of experts in Irish hagiology.

Aileran the Wise is stated (page 206) to have composed at an advanced age three books, *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, "which contain a history of God's kingdom upon earth, interspersed with theological and philosophic researches." But no clue is afforded where the thesaurus is to be found in print or manuscript. Perhaps, after all, it is the same as the work mentioned on the following page. There we learn that the *De Mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae* of the Irish Augustinus belongs to the most eminent productions of native learning in the seventh century. Herein all the Canon's readers will readily coincide.

The Commentary of St. Columbanus contains, it is said (page 614), the text of the Psalms. Would that it did. But take the first example I light upon, on opening the fasciculus of Ascoli's edition that lies next to hand: "Locutus sum-usque-desit mihi" (folio 59 b). Here, almost two verses of Psalm xxxviii. are left out. Nor is this all. The commentary (*non quem statui, sed quem me habiturum praescis*) would be unintelligible without the Irish gloss, which refers *quem* to *finem* of the fifth verse, not to *numerus* of the sixth.

The *Chronicon Scotorum* belongs to the most considerable sources of Irish Church history. So the author states (page 643). But a careful study of the preface to the published edition would have shown conclusively, in opposition to the

opinion of the Rolls' editor, that the so-called *source* was, as Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Cloyne (formerly a possessor of the MS.), rightly conjectured more than a century ago, merely a compendium of Tigernach. But to me the most novel item of information in the whole volume is (page 644), that *The Annals of Ulster* are written in Latin (*in lateinischer Sprache geschrieben*). Yet the compiler professes to have consulted O'Connor's edition, where the Irish text is on the left, and the Latin translation on the right column!

In dealing with the Latin documents of the Early Irish Church, it is essential to understand how the foreign tongue was accommodated to the native idiom. Failure in this has here resulted in a most extraordinary misconception respecting an expression in *The Book of Armagh*. The conclusion of a well-known entry (folio 16 d) is thus given: "Ego scripsi id est Calvus Perennis in conspectu Briani imperatoris Scotorum" (page 637 n.). (The reading, it has to be remarked, is *Briain*, the native genitive.) To avoid the suspicion of unfairness, the author's rendering (page 274) is placed side by side with the translation thereof:—

Ich, nämlich Calvus Perennis, schrieb dieses, in gegenwart des Brian, Kaisers der Iren, und was ich schrieb, bestätigte er im Namen aller Könige mit seinem Wachssiegel.

I, namely Calvus Perennis, wrote this in presence of Brian, Emperor of the Irish, and what I wrote he ratified in the name of all kings with his wax-seal.

Maceria (*stone-wall*), a Biblical word, is here applied in the secondary sense of a fortified town to express the Irish *Caisel*; that is, Cashel, the residence of the Munster kings. The meaning is, accordingly, that Brian made what was written binding upon the future kings of Cashel, namely, of the southern moiety of Ireland. But the present translator took *Maceriae*, I suppose, to be a contraction of *manu cerae*; thereby metamorphosing the city of the kings into a seal of wax.

The following are illustrative of the manner in which historical sources have been drawn upon. *The Annals of Ulster*, we are informed (page 239), give the obit of Maelruain at 792: "Maelruain, of Tallaght, bishop and soldier of Christ,

rested in Christ." This is a translation of the Latin given by Dr. Reeves: *Maelruain Tamlachta, episcopus et miles Christi, in pace dormivit* (*Culdees*, page 126). But it is an imaginary item, formed by analysis from the original. Three years ago I dealt with the question in a manner which Mr. Whitley Stokes, A.B., who was pledged to maintain that Maelruain was a bishop, has been coerced to admit was final. The founder of Tallaght, it is now conceded, was a presbyter abbot. He had in his community a well-known bishop-monk for the performance of episcopal functions. Again, the same *Annals*, it is stated (page 219), say at 920: "On the Saturday before St. Martin, which was the 10th of November, Armagh was plundered," &c. Now, anyone by the aid of a calendar and a table of years with dominical letters attached can correct this; for *g* is the regular letter of November 11. In 920, therefore, the Sunday letter being A, St. Martin's day fell on Saturday. The Saturday before the feast was, consequently, the 4th, not the 10th. The year intended was 921. The Dominical Letter was *g*; November 11, Sunday; November 10, Saturday.

The Cistercians, we read (page 474), had as benefactor Roderic O'Connor, who died in 1233. In proof, extracts are quoted at foot from a charter "of Roderich": *Sciant omnes . . . quod ego O., Dei gratia Connactiae Rex. . .* But Roderic was dead for more than thirty-three years at the time! The O of the donation script stands for the O [*edus*]; that is, Aed, Roderic's son, who, a glance at the *Annals* will show, lost his life in the year in question. It may be some palliation to mention that this item seems taken from De Joubainville. The equation, Aed = Roderic, is of a kind with many more that are destined to immortalize the name of the French Celtologue.

Finally, the absence of independent research is nowhere more painfully apparent than in the portions dealing with the Liturgy. The so-called Bobbio Missal is (page 595) once more accepted as drawn up for an Irish, and not a Burgundian church. Similarly, as if to show the inveteracy of error, the tract *De Cursu Scottorum*, which Spelman, who first published it, rightly took to mean the Office, is

here (page 597) taken for a treatise on the Liturgy; that is, on the Mass. Nay more, the reference to Spelman's *Councils* is appended. Respecting the Stowe Missal, all the conclusions of Mr. Warren, who examined the work in haste, have been adopted (page 598, *sq.*). One is specially to be noted, being as conclusive in its way as *a long in Timeo Danaos*. The accidental displacement of two folios (28, 29) of the MS., whereby a Litany is introduced into the Canon of the Mass, remains undetected (page 599).

The foregoing, which are not exhaustive, are fairly typical. Thereby the reader can judge for himself how far the work has attained the requisite standard. The remaining parts have to deal with periods in which the problems are less complex and the original documents less obscure. The treatment, it may accordingly be anticipated, will prove to be more thorough and more reliable.

B. MACCARTHY.

THE STUDY OF THE HUMAN MIND.¹

AT the present, more than at any other time, great social and political problems have to be faced and solved, and unless men get hold of sound principles those problems can never be settled satisfactorily.

Now without a sound system of Catholic philosophical teaching in all its branches, sound principles cannot be diffused. Our Holy Father, recognising the needs of modern times, in the famous Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, exhorts us to have recourse "to the golden wisdom of St. Thomas, unto the safety and glory of the Catholic faith, the advantage of society, and the progress of all the sciences." But here is the difficulty. It would take an average student three years to master the philosophy of St. Thomas.

¹ *Psychology*. By Michael Maher, S.J.

As for the numberless text-books purporting to be based on the teaching of St. Thomas, they all fail in this, that they do not adequately meet the errors of the present day, nor do they cover the ground required in our present system of public examinations. Any Catholic student competing in these examinations with such knowledge as may be acquired from the ordinary Latin manuals of philosophy would find himself hopelessly handicapped, and would be forced as a condition of success to make himself familiar with the teaching of Mill, and Sully, and Bain.

Who does not recognise the danger of taking such guides to point out the short road to success? Now, however, we have safe guides in these perilous paths. The Mill and Bain school have not the field to themselves. They have been encountered successfully on their own grounds, and have been driven from their favoured positions. In the Encyclical already alluded to, our Holy Father recommends the doctrine of St. Thomas *ad grassantium errorum refutationem*.

In the admirable series of Catholic manuals known as the "Stoneyhurst Series," this seems to be the object in view. The work before us purports to be "an attempt at an English exposition of the psychology of Aristotle and St. Thomas, and an application of their principles to modern questions." The reader who opens this book with a view of finding in it a full exposition of scholastic philosophy will be disappointed. Such is not its character at all. It is rather a book on modern systems with modern methods, and full to overflowing with all the phraseology of the materialist school, with an occasional application of the principles of St. Thomas. Nor do we object to it on this account. On the contrary, we think it desirable that such phrases as "mental phenomena," "psychical phenomena," "psychical existence," may be known as indicating mental accidents; and as such they connote nothing which is not in perfect harmony with the strictest Catholic philosophical teaching. It would be impossible for us, within the limits of this paper, to do more than touch on the leading questions treated of in this erudite work.

THE FACULTIES.

The scholastics, following the teaching of Aristotle and St. Thomas, divided the faculties into five *genera*, which embraced every possible operation of the soul, and which naturally depended on each other. These were :—

1. The vegetative faculty :
 - (a) Generation.
 - (b) Nutrition.
 - (c) Increase.
2. The sensitive faculty :
 - (a) External senses (sight, hearing, taste, smell, touch).
 - (b) Internal senses (common sense, phantasy, estimation, memory).
3. The intellectual faculty :
 - (a) The active intellect.
 - (b) The passive intellect.
4. The appetitive faculty :
 - (a) The sensitive appetite.
 - (b) The intellectual appetite or will.
5. The locomotive faculty.

This we think to be an exhaustive and natural division of the faculties, embracing all the operations of the mind, and growing one out of the other. The lowest faculty is the vegetative, on which all the others depend. The second is the sensitive, on which intelligence depends. The third is intelligence, which appetite presupposes, for “*nihil volitum nisi precognitum*,” and which appetite follows. Lastly comes the locomotive faculty, which presupposes and follows appetite, because every animal is moved to follow that which it desires. This division is simple, it is natural, it is scientific. Eliminating the first and last, as the merely physiological powers of the soul, we have left the *sensitive* faculty, the *intellectual* faculty, and the *appetitive* faculty. This we deem to be a more logical division than that of *cognitional* and *appetitive*.

Sense and intellect do not attain their object *univoce*; the intellect apprehends its object *ut intelligibile* ac proinde *sub ratione veri*; but sense apprehends its object “*ut particu-*

lare et materiale ac proinde non sub ratione veri quia non est intelligibile." On the other hand, the sensitive and rational appetites, although they tend to a *distinct* good, yet seek their object *univoce*, i.e., "sub communi ratione boni."

Ours is the division which seems to find favour with the author of *Psychology*. "Leaving out of account," he writes, "physiological, or extra mental powers of the soul, we have cognitive capabilities of the sensuous order; intellect, or the faculty of rational knowledge; and the two kinds of appetite."

EXTERNAL PERCEPTION.

Since the "*cogito ergo sum*" of Descartes, the question of external perception has been familiar to students of philosophy. Our existence, according to that renowned philosopher, was but an inference from our thought, though it is not easy to see how we can be more certain of our *thought* than of our *existence*. Yet for hundreds of years that dictum has tinged the philosophy of Europe. The followers of Descartes, and the followers of those who evolved their philosophy from his, agreed in denying any *immediate* certainty of external reality. On the other hand, we have all the schoolmen, and many of the best modern thinkers, affirming that we have an immediate knowledge of things outside our minds; that, therefore, we know the existence of our own bodies, and of other bodies, with a knowledge which does not require proof.

Our author treats this subject admirably, and, in an exhaustive history of modern theories bearing on the subject, shows how one false theory grew out of another, until they led to the wildest aberrations of the human intellect.

In his account of the development of sense perception, and of the education of the senses, he shows that though we have an immediate knowledge of realities outside of the thinking self, yet they are at first vague and indefinite, and are made fully known to us by the aid of experience. In our mature life we have little difficulty in

localizing our bodily sensations. But, in reality, this is the result of a gradual process :—

“ It is probably, however, the experience of ‘ double contact,’ which contributes most to the definition of the relative situation of the several parts of the organism. If a child lays his right hand upon his left, there is awakened a double tactual feeling of extension. If then he moves the right palm along the left arm up to the elbow or shoulder, he becomes conscious of a series of muscular sensations in the right arm, and also of a series of extended tactual impressions both on the right hand and along the left arm, which vary in character as they depart from the original sensation in the left hand. This movement may be then reversed, and the tactual sensations gone through in the opposite direction ; and, finally, by laying the left arm along a flat surface, or *vice versa*, the series of tactual impression formerly given in succession will now be presented as co-existing outside of each other in space. When these or kindred experiments have been executed, the difference in character of the tactual impressions on two points of the arm awaken by association a representation of the number of tactual sensations, and of the duration of the series of muscular sensations required to span the interval, and their relative situations are so far defined.”

Though a pain in the large toe seems a simple thing, yet it is evident from the above reasoning that the process by which that knowledge is attained is very slow and complex.

Again, how simple seems our perception of distance : with one glance we take in a whole landscape, or an arm of the sea, and measure them ; yet the perception has been gradually elaborated :—

“ The primary perception of the eye is simply *coloured surface* ; neither distance, solidity, nor *absolute magnitude* is originally presented to us by this sense. There are secondary or acquired perceptions gained by associating in experience various shades of colour and degrees of tension in the ocular muscles with different motor and tactual experiences. Surface space, however, is originally perceived directly.”

As to the objection that it is impossible to conceive *how* the mind can be cognizant of a thing outside itself, the author replies :—

“ It is at least fully as impossible to understand how the mind can be cognizant of *itself*. *How* mind and body are united : *how* either can act upon the other ; or, indeed, *how* any one thing can

move another, are to our present faculties insoluble questions. But the *fact* that there is interaction cannot be denied, any more than the growth of plants or the existence of gravitation, merely because we cannot imagine how such an event is possible. If the living body is informed and is animated throughout its whole being by a spiritual soul, why should not the sentient organism so constituted be capable of responding to a material stimulus by an immediately percipient act? *A priori* dogmas as to what is or what is not impossible are here out of place, especially in the hands of Empiricists. To experience we must appeal; and this testifies that in sensations of pressure and sight we are immediately percipient of something other than our own mental states."

FREE-WILL.

The question of free-will is of the most far-reaching consequence, for it branches out into all the kindred sciences. The opponents of free-will hold that our actions are all determined by a preponderance of motives; that the stronger always prevail, and prevail *necessarily*. The author of *Psychology* enters fully into this all-important question. Defining free-will to be the "capability of self-determination," he proceeds to establish his thesis on three different lines—the psychological, the ethical, and the metaphysical. The gist of the psychological proof consists in this, that we are conscious of a *self-determining* power; that while we are swayed by one class of motives we are conscious of a power to do the opposite:—

"Some thought or desire of a morally forbidden nature enters my mind; a malevolent feeling; an emotion of vanity; an impure image; or an angry impulse. The evil state may have been present for some time before I advert to its illicit character. So long as this is the case it is strictly involuntary, and I am not responsible for it. Now, however, becoming aware that I ought to reject it, I endeavour to do so by turning my mind from it. The thought recurs, and the struggle may be very troublesome and annoying before I finally conquer. At every instant of the struggle I am resisting manfully the predominant gratification. On the most unequivocal testimony that my consciousness can afford me, I am convinced that I can only too easily give way, and that it is by painful effort I restrain myself from so doing. Throughout the struggle I distinctly realize that it is *wrong* to yield, and the motive possesses for me a genuine attraction; but still it is a complete perversion of facts to say that my cognition of the rightness of this course converts it into a pleasure which for me outbalances the agreeableness of the gratification, and inexorably draws me to this side."

The burden of the ethical argument in favour of free-will is, that if we are over-ruled by forces which we cannot restrain, there is no meaning in such words as duty, obligation, responsibility, merit. No man can deserve either praise or blame for actions over which he has no more control than a cork in the surface of the sea has control over its own movements.

The nucleus of the metaphysical argument, which is very elaborate, and to which its author attaches much importance as explaining the *cause* of our freedom, may be found in the following extract from Lehmkuhl on human acts:—

“Circa aliquod objectum etiam homo in hac terra liber proprio sensu non est, sed necessario in illud fertur amando, quando actum voluntatis erga illud ponit: scilicet circa boni speciem universam atque communem. Hæc enim est voluntatis interna et necessaria natura, ut, quidquid velit seu amplectatur, sub ratione boni velit et amet, sub ratione mali nolit et aversetur. Verum quoniam omnia bona singula, imo ipsa summi boni assecutio saltem specie tenus quoddam malum seu difficultatem conjunctam habent, homo hic in terris in singulis bonis separationem volendis et amplectendis per se liber est.”

In this connection we think that the author's powers of answering difficulties are more effectual even than his powers of exposition:—

“1. It is affirmed that our internal experience is in favour of the *necessarian* view. Introspection tells us that we are always determined by motives, and also denies ‘that we are conscious of being able to act in opposition to the strongest present desire or aversion.’ By ‘strongest,’ is meant strongest estimated in quantity of pleasure or pain. Now, here we come to the point of assertion and denial about an ultimate fact of consciousness which is incapable of demonstration, and which each must examine for himself. We hold that each man's own internal experience reveals the fact that he can at times resist the strongest desire or aversion, and, we believe that most men at least occasionally, do so. In involuntary acts we admit also that we are inevitably necessitated by our character and the motives operating on us. Even in deliberate choice we are influenced by the greater weight of motive on one side, but we are not *inexorably determined* thereby.”

“2. The strongest motives always prevail. This is either a tautological statement, or it is untrue. If strength of motive is

to be determined by its final prevalence, then it is an identical proposition affirming the undeniable truth that the motive which prevails, *does* prevail. This seems Dr. Bain's view. Mill, however, says by *strongest* is meant most pleasurable. In this sense the statement must be denied, and appeal made to our first argument."

NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THE HUMAN SOUL.

In the chapter called "Rational Psychology" we have a treatment of all the leading questions concerning the human soul: What are we? Whence come we? What have we to do? What is there to hope for?

These have ever been questions of transcendent interest, and never more so than at the present day. Beside them the most brilliant discoveries in the region of empirical facts, whether physical or psychical, sink into almost insignificance.

The chapters on the substantiality, and simplicity, and spirituality, and immortality of the human soul, are treated in a clear and novel manner, and are in the author's best style. But when we come to the chapter on the origin of the human soul, we feel that the author is on dangerous ground, as he seems to lean to theories which advocates of the literal meaning of the Biblical narrative will consider temerarious. We will venture no opinion on the subject, but will let the author speak for himself:—

"The third school agrees with the second in maintaining that all the lower animals, and the bodily frame of the first man may have been produced by a divinely-directed evolution from a few—possibly from a single original type; but they are clear and emphatic in teaching that the *first rational soul*, and consequently the first *human being*, cannot have arisen by evolution. It must, they assert, have been brought into existence by the special creative intervention of God. In this view, God may have formed the *body* of Adam out of some highly-developed animal, which he modified as much as was requisite, and then infused with a rational soul.

"It is sometimes urged that this hypothesis makes Adam the offspring of an ape; that he would therefore owe filial reverence and obedience to a brute parent; and that, consequently, the theory is degrading to human nature. Now, it seems to us that such a line of argument is based on a complete misinterpretation of the view in question. Whatever real dignity man has got comes from the soul, not from the body; and in any case it is

not easy to see that an animal organism, developed to as high a state of perfection as physical laws can bring it, is baser material to form the body of man than the "slime" of the earth. . . On the grounds of reason alone there can, it seems to us, be no cogent argument framed against such a hypothesis when carefully stated. It is indisputable that God *could* form the body of the first man as easily out of a living organism as out of dead matter. And were the general doctrine of evolution *demonstrated* as regards all other animal organisms, there would in the light of pure reason be obviously—from the likeness of the life-history of the individual human body to that of the brute—a fair presumption in favour of a similar origin.

"The real question, then, for the Catholic is: can the *revealed* doctrine of Holy Writ be reconciled with this theory? The most general and reasonable canon of Scriptural interpretation is, that the natural and literal sense of a passage is always to be accepted until sufficiently cogent reason can be adduced for deviating from that meaning. The problem, therefore, is: taking all scientific evidence in favour of evolution, on the one side; and, on the other, the presumption in favour of the literal signification of the particular Scriptural texts directly bearing on the point; the meanings, literal and mystical, attached to other passages related to the former; the consensus of traditional theological teaching, as far as this testimony may fairly be acted on, what is, at least in certain important aspects, a new question, together with scientific objections urged against the development hypothesis—taking, we say, all this evidence into account—is the evolutionist interpretation of Holy Writ legitimate? The question thus stated is not for the rational psychologist, but for the theologian to answer. The Church has not yet made any pronouncement on the subject, and it would under the circumstances seem unjustifiable to condemn the wider interpretation as absolutely untenable."

We have now done with this remarkable book. It is a thoroughly scientific work, evincing on the part of its author great powers of analysis and discrimination, with the most profound and varied knowledge of philosophical literature. Yet it is not without faults. Its style is, on the whole, ponderous, and much of its phraseology too technical. But the book is a distinct gain to psychological science, and unquestionably places its young and gifted author in the front rank of the clear, deep thinkers of our time.

JAMES COYLE.

THE "MADONNA" IN THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

TRAFALGAR-SQUARE is said to be the finest site in Europe, and by so many that it would be invidious to name individuals. Not being a travelled man I cannot say how much truth is in the assertion, but certainly the crowded omnibuses in their variegated colours filing thickly past in all directions; the smart hansoms making their precarious way through them without a hitch; the noble buildings that flank the square; the contiguous thoroughfares teeming with gay and busy life; the fountains playing in the sunshine; the majestic column with bravery personified at its base and summit by the constant lions and the hero Nelson; Whitehall with its vista of splendid offices; the towers of the Houses of Parliament lifting their graceful heads against the sky, as if conscious of their beauty—all this, together with the ample space the square itself encloses, would, when viewed from the point of vantage, seduce even a non-Britisher into listening to the statement with respect. At any rate, Trafalgar-square is about the liveliest spot in London, and the National Gallery occupies the finest side of it. "Very well," I can fancy someone interrupting, "but what is this to us? Being in the very centre of the head-quarters of heresy, what possible interest can such a magnificent spot have for readers so orthodox as those of the I. E. RECORD?" The interruption is quite natural, and I will try to answer it.

The National Gallery contains more Catholic treasure than any other building in the British Empire. It was founded, and is supported, by the nation at considerable cost as a receptacle for attainable works of art of the highest merit. Whether by accident or by design, the works actually collected consist exclusively of paintings and other products of brush and pencil. Though the collection in 1838 numbered only 150 pictures, it has now been swelled by purchase, presentation, and bequest, into a grand total, actually on view, of 1,100. There are twenty-two spacious rooms of varying sizes in the gallery, not counting the

octagonal hall and the vestibules. In these rooms the pictures are arranged, as correctly as may be, according to "schools" and "period." In the more restricted sense there are no fewer than twenty-four different schools of painting represented in this superb depository, but these admit of being classified correctly into two departments—the British and the foreign. About one-fourth of the vast mural area of the gallery is hung with pictures of the British schools, and the remaining three-fourths with those of the foreign schools. I mean, of course, the occupied area. The relative proportion of paintings in these two broad departments will be better gauged by thus stating it according to amount rather than according to number, for the foreign paintings are, individually, the larger. If I had to speak numerically, however, I should say that seven hundred belong to the foreign, and four hundred to the British schools.

Now, this great mass of foreign art is eminently Catholic, and, with the exception of a small section of the later Dutch school, exclusively so. The Catholic element, therefore, in the National Gallery is pretty nearly as three to one. Fully one-half of these continental paintings were finished before the "Reformation" was born, while all of them had their rise in regions which, with the exception of a part of Holland, the Reformation has never in the least affected. This statement becomes all the more significant, when it is remembered that the schismatical area in Europe—Russia, Greece, Turkey, and adjuncts—is not represented in the Gallery, any more than the heretical area of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The significance is accentuated by the further fact that eleven out of the twenty-six compartments are devoted to the Italian school alone, which is perfectly represented here in its infancy, growth, and decline. The French and Spanish schools have one room each, while the Flemish, Belgium and Holland is accorded three. Indeed, anybody visiting the National Gallery cannot but be struck by the fact, that quite half its occupied wall-space is covered with the pictures of the *Latin* countries.

Not alone in origin is the foreign department Catholic,

but also in inspiration. Of the seven hundred I have mentioned, I counted three hundred and twenty of a sacred character, and the proportion would be greater still in a square-foot measurement, as the sacred pictures individually cover the greater area. Of the remainder, the subject of only very few, indeed, is from the pagan classics ; while in none of them is it of a gratuitously offensive kind. Landscape, river scenery, popular customs, allegories, and portraits are to be seen when the subject does not happen to be scriptural or ecclesiastical. But the most remarkable thing that strikes one is the preponderance among the sacred pictures of those that show forth the glorious attributes of our Blessed Lady. So striking was this to me that I set myself to count them, with the result of finding that one hundred and fifty out of the three hundred and twenty are of a subject in which the Blessed Virgin plays a prominent—I had almost said *the* prominent—part. Look where you will, her holiness is emphasized, and the Catholic glance would detect it in an instant, even though there were no "Madonna and Child," or its equivalent, sweetly painted on the frame for the guidance of those who are not yet among her clients. Grave and joyous, and sad and tender, and youthful and aged, and human and heavenly, does she appear, in turn, according to the quality of the artist's inspiration : but through all there is diffused that divine maternity which makes her blessed among women, now and for all time, as it made her at Ephesus, and at Nazareth, and in the dwelling of her cousin in the hill-country.

Mr. Ruskin in his *Lectures on Art* (Lecture i., No. 27), says :—"The art of any country is the exponent of its social and political virtues ;" and, again : "The art of any country is an exact exponent of its ethical life." In the light of this twofold axiom, the fault is not mine if I read in the National Gallery the highest tribute to the social and political virtues of the middle ages. It is but natural to assume that the management of the building did not go out of its way to secure pictures of the "Madonna." Nay, if it were swayed by prejudice at all in its search, it would most likely have pursued the opposite course. But the fair assumption is,

that the gentlemen managing the National Gallery desired specimens of the highest art, irrespective of its subject, and that, *cæteris paribus*, they preferred variety of subject to monotony. How, then, account for the overwhelming number of "Madonnas"? In this way: that the masters in the art countries made the "Madonna" their subject, almost as a matter of course; and this view will be borne out by even a cursory glance over any respectable art catalogue. Now, the popular taste had to be consulted four hundred years ago quite as much as now; and, therefore, by putting two and two together, we conclude that the people of those times delighted most of all in representation of the Virgin Mother of God. The "Madonna," then, it was that fashioned their "ethical life," for where one's treasure is, there is his heart also; and the heart it is that gives its essential colour to our morality (*vide* Matt. xv. 19). Would to God the ethical life of our times were shaped to a greater extent under the same holy influence. Tenderness, purity, gentleness, meekness, humility, fortitude—all of which are bound up with the notion of the Madonna—are richly diffused among a people who love her; for to love is to wish to become as like as possible to that we love. When certain persons in more northern climes to-day affect, perchance in their envy, to pity the simplicity of the middle ages, they forget that their every feeling is more or less vitiated by mercenary aims; that human nature is tolerable only when sweetened by the fragrance of our Lady's virtues; that the tenor of their own being has been deprived—I am not saying through their own fault—of that chivalry which devotion to her inspires, and which shakes from the soul the sordid shackles of this world. They expect us to consider them consistent, because, forsooth, they take Christ for their immediate love; but they forget again what Father Faber conveys in his beautiful hymn:—

"Ah! little know they of thy worth,
Who would deny thy love to me.

And, oh! how can I love thy Son,
Sweet Mother, if I love not thee?

Indeed, I have suggested to me here the reason of a certain epithet, as silly as it is impudent, constantly applied to the middle ages. It was hitherto a puzzle to me that even malice could dare to call those ages "dark" which produced a Raphael, a Titian, a Da Vinci, a Michael Angelo, and others by the score who come very closely up to these great masters in their refined inspirations. The puzzle was not the less difficult to solve because of knowing that those very names were held in honour by the accusers of the times they lived in; and when I read around the splendid octagon of the National Gallery "The works of those who have stood the test of ages have a claim to that respect and reverence to which no modern can pretend," I could not but smile—in all charity, I hope—at British inconsistency, while proud of this fearless expression of British fairness. Still the puzzle remained; but it remains no longer. The fact is, that those who make vulgar sneers at the "dark" ages, do in malice what even the plea of ignorance cannot excuse, and this is their reason. The genius of the "dark" ages ran in a religious channel, and was fed from the mystery of the Incarnation, as from an inexhaustible source. Now our Lady's position in the Incarnation is necessarily too prominent to be pleasing to certain of her critics, for whom aestheticism and atheism have one and the same meaning. Pity it is that those great men who have written their names in imperishable art did not take to coal-mining or nitrates, or East-African civilization, *a la mode*, with an ultimate wind-up to their career to the tune of two-and-sixpence in the pound. Then would light have brooded over darkness till it hatched steam-engines, and divorce courts, and the stock exchange. But to revert to the cooler process of narration.

To assign an absolute aggregate value to the pictures in the National Gallery—I speak all along of the foreign schools—is a difficult, if not an impossible task. Without a fiscal standard of value, the popular intellect cannot apply the rules of arithmetic. None but the connoisseurs could tell you to the farthing their single or collective worth, and even they differ among themselves very considerably sometimes, as is evinced by the history of Millet's "Angelus," which

a little more than twenty years ago was sold for £80, and, after undergoing a series of petty sales, has recently been bought in Paris at the figure of £30,000. The difference here is clearly more than a farthing's worth. Hence, though we know the actual purchase-money of certain pictures in the National Gallery, it would be erroneous to conclude that the rule of multiplication would give us the purchase-money of the lot. Multiplication cannot be applied where the standard of value shifts up and down, as all subjective standards must. The picture, of course, that everybody knows of is the "Madonna Ansdei," by Raphael, which was purchased for the Gallery of the Government from the Duke of Marlborough for £70,000. I am not qualified to say whether the Government or the Duke of Marlborough profited by the bargain. Until the price fetched lately by Millet's "Angelus," this was more than three times the sum ever paid for any other picture. It is by universal consent the gem of the collection. It is one of the few whose beauties strike the amateur as forcibly as the connoisseur, and when the "Salve Mater Christi," made part and parcel of the painting by the master's own hand, first caught my eye, I was bigot enough to glow with pride in the thought that the greatest work of art in this, the very focus of Protestant civilization, is replete with Mary's honour, and with devotion to her by an acknowledged genius among the sons of men. Its money-value, as I have stated, is set down at an exceptionally high figure, and is no criterion, therefore, to the value of the others; but, supposing the average value of each, including the "Madonna Ansdei," to be £2,000—not too much, considering the individual cost of many—the mass of foreign painting in the National Gallery would represent considerably more than a million and a quarter sterling. Was I not accurate, therefore, in saying that no other building in the British Empire encloses so much Catholic treasure?

In stepping aside for a short time from the region of fact into that of comment, I do not pretend to the authority of an art critic, but am writing as one of the average public, which numbers ninety out of every one hundred that visit the National Gallery, and whose original views, so seldom

made known, may be interesting, if only by directing attention to points that strike an ordinary visitor.

It is very hard to get over the idea that the *humanity* of the infant Christ is somewhat unnecessarily emphasized in some few of the paintings. I am not at all suggesting an allusion to "Sartor Resartus," or its philosophy. I refer simply and solely to the attitudes which the Infant is made to take. "The Wisdom of the Father" can hardly be conceived in a position so suggestive of levity as that, *v. g.*, in No. 17 and No. 29, two "Holy Families," by Andrea del Sarto and Barocci, respectively. The purpose of the early "Madonnas" is evident. Spirations and doves, and glories and aureolas, indicate designedly the divinity of the Infant Christ, and the divine maternity of His mother. This symbolism is either absent altogether or very much attenuated in the "Madonnas" of the Renaissance, the purpose evidently being to direct attention to the humanity rather than the divinity of our Saviour. How captivately this has been accomplished, may be seen in the National Gallery; and if this is not true of all, it is because in a few, such as I have mentioned, the purpose is overdone.

Again, there are held in high honour in the Gallery some pictures which the average citizen would not take in exchange for the prints in his cottage parlour. Look at No. 564, *v. g.*, of which the "Madonna and Child" are the central figure. There is a foolish look upon the mother's face, as if she did not know what on earth was the meaning of the child on her lap. There is a sourness, too, which seems to make her say, "How long must I keep sitting here making an exhibition of myself?" The child itself occupies a most impossible position somehow, and is much too set and much too "dogmatic" for an infant in arms. The two angels adoring on either side have the outline of winged women, but the figure is that of a canary in a very listening attitude. To the left, St. John in the caldron of burning oil is posed with geometrical accuracy as to head, arms, and elbows, and for all the world presents in dim outline the figure of a section of the new Forth bridge. The angel, too, seems to be baptizing him *per vim* in a modern font rather than delivering

him from a steaming caldron; and, on the whole, so far as anatomy is concerned a tyro in a modern drawing-school would execute more accurate figures.

And yet this is a very highly valued painting, and the reason will be suggested by the date upon the frame (1216-1293), recording the year of the birth and of the death of Margaritone the painter. It must be remembered that the aim of the early painters was nothing if not symbolical and ideal. The Church was their only patron, and the Church's supreme purpose then as now was to teach moral and dogmatic truth to her children. In the case of the masses of the population this was most effectually accomplished by pictures displayed prominently in the churches¹ as altar-pieces—more especially as printing was a long way off invention at the time. Engrossed, therefore, in his one great aim, the painter attended not to the mundane elegance of his figures; and, indeed, if he did, it is questionable whether the purpose of the Church would not be more or less interfered with. Remembering this let it also be remembered that the National Gallery is a study rather than an exhibition, and as such it was intended. Nobody questions why the crudest specimens of early literature are preserved in the British Museum. Their value is at once seen in the criterion they afford for estimating the character, customs, and general state of the age they were written in, and the measure of progress made in the intervening centuries. Crude specimens of early painting serve the same purpose for the initiated, and if this purpose does not strike the average visitor to the National Gallery as it strikes him in the British Museum, it is because the art of literature is infinitely more popularized than that of painting. An illustration not so accurate, but more tangible, perhaps, in this commercial age, would be afforded by the crude realization of Stephenson or Watts, and the modifications that have culminated in the latest "flying cosmopolitan" at Swindon or Crewe.

¹ This explains why this particular picture in common with so many others of the same period is a piece of church decoration.

Just a word or two about the British schools.¹ Except one sole picture of the reign of Charles I. they possess none that I could make out of an earlier date than the middle of the eighteenth century; and of the four hundred or so in number I could find but four the subject of which is in any way religious. Contrasted with the foreign schools this is suggestive. England is unquestionably rich in monuments of its former devotion to the Mother of God. Waterton's *Pietas Mariana Britannica* abounds with the most gratifying information on this score, and everybody that has not time to verify all that this learned and careful volume so circumstantially certifies to, needs only to pay a visit to Oxford to get an inkling of how vividly all is verifiable. This being so, it is pardonable to ask why is there not a single specimen of old English Catholic art—and by implication not a single old picture of our Lady—in the National Gallery? Had England no contemporaries in art with the pre-Reformation masters of the Continent; and, if not, why not? If she had, are their names preserved; and, if not, why not? If preserved, why not more generally known? Finally, are there any old English fresco or easel paintings extant; and, if so (and I believe there must be), why has not a place been found for them among the cherished national property in Trafalgar-square? If "Our Ladyes" were as numerous in the British, as "Madonnas" in the foreign schools, the silent grace of reflection would be occasioned in many sincere and earnest souls. As English hands would paint her, the Mother of the Word Incarnate would recall the "Merrie England" of their fathers, the England of the *Ave Maria* and the Convent bells, the England of chivalry in war, of plenty in peace. It is pleasant, indeed, to write in this strain until reflection—not altogether in angelic garb—comes and brings one back to the prosaic present. And yet it is not all prosaic; nor is it of unmixed sadness. Efforts not unstrengthened by God's

¹ There are but few Irish names among the British Masters; but they are very honoured names. They are William Mulready, Daniel Maclise, and Sir Martin Shee, who succeeded Sir Thomas Lawrence as President of the Royal Academy.

right arm are being made to win back her dower for our Lady, and with a measure of success, so far, that has lifted hope out of the region of the forlorn. While, unfortunately, antagonistic on many points, it is gratifying to feel that on this one, at all events, our Catholic people, irrespective of nationality, know but one purpose. I should become easily misunderstood if I followed up this thought; but, though Irish in every bone and fibre, I cannot forget that the Church and schools in many of the most crowded Irish quarters in England are mainly due to English Catholics who generously backed with their pounds the equally generous pence of the Irish poor. Surely I am no sycophant for hoping that union on this score will generate union in others also; that, though it do not, our differences will, at least, shed all their bitterness at the common shrine of "Our Lady of Peace"—a title of the Mother of our Lord that was not unknown to the heart of ancient England.

ANDREW DOOLEY.

VARIOUS CONFRATERNITIES AND CONDITIONS TO BE OBSERVED IN ERECTING THEM.

CONFRATERNITY OF THE HOLY ROSARY.

It is now practically certain that the Rosary owes its present form to St. Dominic. Before his time, it is true, many persons employed contrivances resembling our beads to enable them to reckon with greater facility the number of times they might repeat a certain prayer. But the prayers thus repeated were not fixed, any more than was the number of repetitions. In both these respects the piety or peculiar taste of each individual was left quite free. St. Dominic, instructed it is said by the Blessed Virgin herself, regulated what prayers should be repeated, the order in which they should be repeated, and the number of repetitions. And in addition to this, and to prevent the weariness caused by mere oral prayer, he selected the chief events in the history of our

Lord and His Blessed Mother to supply subjects for meditation during the recital of the prayers. It was while Dominic was engaged in trying to win back the Albigensian heretics that the Blessed Virgin is said to have taught him this form of prayer. She also exhorted him to preach and teach it everywhere, and promised that success would attend his efforts. Dominic promptly obeyed, and the Blessed Virgin was faithful to her promise ; for in a short time more than one hundred thousand of the fanatical and brutal Albigensians were received into the true Church.

Shortly after this, Dominic founded the Order of Friars Preachers, and wherever the brothers went they taught the people the beautiful prayer they had learned from their founder. Its simplicity, the excellence of the prayers of which it is composed, and above all, the wonderful graces which the recital of it procured, made it at once the most popular of devotions. And though it is now nearly seven hundred years since it was composed, it has not palled on the taste of the people, nor fallen into disuse, but is, on the contrary, more dear to the faithful, more universally practised by them, and more highly honoured and praised by the Church, and by her Infallible Head than ever it was before.

Confraternities of the Rosary are said to date from the time of St. Dominic himself. This much, at least, appears certain, that such confraternities came into existence before the end of the century (the thirteenth), in the beginning of which St. Dominic composed the Rosary.

Erection of a Confraternity.

A priest about to establish a confraternity of the Rosary first obtains the written approval of his bishop. In missionary countries such as ours, bishops can give their priest the necessary facilities for the canonical erection even of confraternities of the Rosary, without reference to the General of the Dominicans. The latter, however, must be approached, even in missionary countries, if a priest wishes the members of his confraternity to have a share in certain special favours and indulgences granted only to confraternities of the Rosary erected by Dominicans, or with the consent of their

General. In countries not under the care of Propaganda, the consent of the latter is necessary for the valid erection of one of these confraternities.

When necessary, then, the priest will forward his bishop's letter, approving of the erection of a confraternity of this title, to the General of the Dominicans, and having received his sanction, he will transmit it to the bishop for authentication. The bishop having replied to this communication, and having appointed a Director, the inauguration of the confraternity may take place at once.

The ceremony of erecting this confraternity consists merely in entering the names in a register. This, however, the Director himself should do, unless prevented by some cause. If he cannot do it himself, he should appoint someone, and should authenticate the register afterwards in the usual way.

Conditions for Gaining the Indulgences.

To gain all the indulgences belonging to this confraternity, besides having one's name entered in the register, it is necessary—(1) to have beads blessed by a priest having the Dominican faculties—these faculties, be it understood, are different from those obtained from the Propaganda, and can be had only from the General or Provincial of the Dominican Order; and (2) to say the fifteen decades of the Rosary each week. To fulfil this latter condition it is not necessary to say even a chaplet—that is, five decades—without interruption. The fifteen must be said within the seven days, but may be spread over the whole time, as best suits one's taste or convenience. To gain each separate indulgence, the special conditions for that indulgence must also be fulfilled.

THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT.

This confraternity originated in Rome about the beginning of the sixteenth century. A few pious persons living near the Church of St. Mary *supra Minervam* agreed among themselves to practice a special devotion to the Most Holy Sacrament in this Church. They undertook, among other

things, to see that everything should be provided which outward respect for this Adorable Sacrament demanded. They looked after the perpetual lamp, the altar linens, the tabernacle, the sacred vessels—everything, in a word, necessary for the becoming celebration of the sacred mysteries, or the reverent safe-keeping of the Blessed Sacrament. The first founders of this practical form of devotion were soon joined by others; and at length, in 1539, Paul III. issued a Bull, in which he approved of the devotion, laid down rules for the guidance of the associates, and granted them important indulgences.

The original rules to be observed by the members of the confraternity of the Most Holy Sacrament were substantially as follows:—

1. To be ever solicitous for the reverence due to the Blessed Sacrament, and to prove their solicitude by taking care that a lamp was kept continually burning before the tabernacle in which the Blessed Sacrament reposed, and that the altar was suitably ornamented.

2. When the resources of the Church were not sufficient for the above purposes, the associates were to provide, or at least assist in providing, the means in carrying them out.

3. They were to accompany the Blessed Sacrament when carried to the sick. This rule, however, regarded men alone, and them only when their compliance with it did not interfere with their duties. Woman associates, instead of accompanying the Blessed Sacrament, were to say a short prayer. It is hardly necessary to add, that this rule referred only to those Catholic countries where the Blessed Sacrament is carried publicly by a vested priest to the sick.

4. When any member of the confraternity fell sick, the Director or Parish Priest, accompanied by another member, was to visit him, and prepare him for the worthy reception of the last sacraments.

Each member of the confraternity was to say five *Paters* and *Aves* each week in honour of the Blessed Sacrament.

Such, in substance, were the chief rules of the original confraternity established in the Church of the Minerva, but each bishop may modify them to suit the circumstances of

his diocese, or of the particular church in which the confraternity is to be established.

Erection of a Confraternity.

When a priest wishes to establish a confraternity of the Most Holy Sacrament in his parish or church, he must first obtain his bishop's approval, in writing, and also a copy of the rules which the bishop wishes the members to observe. Having done this he may at once proceed to enrol members; for this being one of the confraternities which require only episcopal sanction to confer on them all the privileges granted to the arch-confraternity, affiliation is altogether unnecessary. No ceremony is necessary for the reception of members; no formula is to be pronounced; the names are merely to be entered in the register, and even this may be done by anyone acting in the name of the Parish Priest or Director. The register is to be kept in the church, and the names of the members need not be sent anywhere. The only two essential points therefore are—1, the bishop's sanction; and 2, the entering of the names in the register.

CONFRATERNITY OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS.

The first confraternities of the Sacred Heart are said to have been established in England.¹ Father de la Colombière, the saintly director of the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque, and after her the first to consecrate himself to devotion to the Sacred Heart, was sent by his superiors to labour in the English mission in the month of September, 1676. The extraordinary revelations made by our Lord to the holy nun had convinced her confessor of the power of this new devotion to appease God's anger, and to win the hearts of men. Accordingly in the new and dangerous field to which obedience obliged him to transfer his labours, he continually preached and taught this devotion, as St. Dominic had taught the devotion of the Rosary among the Albigensian heretics. In the journal of a spiritual retreat, made while in

¹ *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, 4th series, coll. 1235-66.

England, he writes in reference to this devotion: "Finishing this retreat full of confidence in the mercy of God, I have made a resolution to procure by every possible means the execution of what my divine Master has ordered for the accomplishment of His desires, touching the devotion which He has suggested to a person to whom He communicates Himself most confidently." Needless to say, he kept this resolution, and among the means by which he laboured to procure the execution of his Master's desire was the establishment of confraternities in honour of the Sacred Heart.¹

Similar confraternities were soon after established in France, the birthplace of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. From France they spread rapidly into other countries, so that between the years 1697 and 1726 the Holy See approved of no fewer than three hundred and ten confraternities of the Sacred Heart canonically established in different parts of the world.²

Later on, in 1801, the priests of the Congregation of St. Paul received permission from Cardinal de Somaglia, Vicar of Rome, to establish a confraternity of the Sacred Heart in the Church of St. Mary *ad Pineam* in that city. Two years afterwards it was made an arch-confraternity by a Brief of Pius VII., of Jan. 25, 1803. "This devotion spread so rapidly," writes Bouvier,³ "and the priests of the Congregation of St. Paul promoted it so zealously, that between 1803 and 1822 there were nineteen hundred and sixty-two aggregated confraternities. And how many others since then! An immense number of fervent souls form this great family. They are separated by space, but are all united by the bonds of an universal love in the Sacred Heart of Jesus."

Erection of a Confraternity.

A confraternity of the Sacred Heart may be established in every church and in every parish, it being one of those excepted from the regulation of Clement VIII., regarding distance.

In missionary countries the approbation of the Ordinary is alone required for the valid establishment of this as of all

¹ *Analecta*, *ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, 1237.

³ *Treatise on Indulgences*.

other confraternities. A priest, then, having obtained his bishop's permission, with a copy of the special statutes, may at once enrol the names of the members. Bouvier states that confraternities of the Sacred Heart, erected by bishops having the necessary faculties from the Holy See, do not enjoy to their full extent, without affiliation, the privileges accorded to those affiliated to the arch-confraternity in Rome. It may, however, be very legitimately inferred from a Rescript of the Propaganda, already frequently referred to, that confraternities erected in missionary countries, with the approval of the bishop of the place, enjoy all the privileges of affiliation, though not affiliated.

A priest having power to establish confraternities of the Sacred Heart, or to aggregate to the arch-confraternity, by merely taking down the names of persons wishing to become members, at once bestows on them all the privileges of membership. It would not seem to be necessary even to send on the names to the arch-confraternity, though it would be well to do so.¹

THE SCAPULAR OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

This scapular was first distributed by the Venerable Ursula Benincasia, foundress of the Theatine Sisters, to whom it is said to have been miraculously recommended by our divine Lord and His blessed Mother. On the Feast of the Purification, in the year 1617, we are told Ursula, being rapt in ecstasy, beheld our blessed Lady holding the divine Infant in her arms, and surrounded by an immense concourse of virgins, dressed as was our Lady herself, in white, and having on their shoulders mantles of blue. The Blessed Virgin, speaking to her devout client, said: "Courage, Ursula, cease weeping; let your sighs be changed into accents of joy; listen attentively to the words which my Jesus, and thine, who reclines on my breast, will address to you." Our divine Lord, in turn, spoke to Ursula, saying: "I desire that you will build a hermitage in which thirty virgins shall live according to the rule of the hermits, under the title of the *Immaculate Conception*, and clothed as is My

¹ Maurel.

Mother. I promise to grant special graces and spiritual gifts in abundance to those who embrace this manner of life, and fulfil all that shall be prescribed for them in that holy asylum."

Ursula, notwithstanding the great joy which inundated her soul at this heavenly vision, and at the sweet voices of the divine Infant and His Mother, felt grieved that those favours should be granted to so few. She, therefore, made bold to ask our Lord to extend them to all who should wear the little blue scapular, observe chastity according to their state, and have a special devotion to the Holy Virgin conceived without sin. Ursula understood that her prayer was granted, for immediately she saw multitudes of angels distributing the blue scapular throughout all parts of the earth.

Ursula lost no time in having scapulars made, which she herself distributed, having, however, had them previously blessed by a priest. The number of those anxious to be vested in this new habit of the Sinless Virgin increased from day to day. The devotion was well received by the ecclesiastical authorities, and many indulgences accorded to it by the Sovereign Pontiffs. The Theatine Fathers, by whom the Order founded by St. Ursula is governed, were granted the privilege of blessing and conferring the blue scapular. Their General, however, by virtue of special powers granted to him by Pius IX.,¹ can delegate this faculty to other priests whether secular or regular. The faculties given by Propaganda to bishops and priests in countries under their charge include the faculties necessary for investing with this scapular. As the wearers of the blue scapular do not constitute a confraternity,² no registration of names is required.³

This scapular consists of two pieces of woollen cloth, of a sky-blue, or azure colour. The colour or material of the strings is of no importance. The scapular must be worn, like all scapulars, round the neck, one end being on the breast, the other between the shoulders.

D. O'LOAN.

¹ Sept. 9, 1851.

² S. Ind. Cong., Apr. 27, 1887, *ad. 5*.

³ Maurel, who states that, though the Theatines themselves enter the names of those who receive the blue scapular from them, they do not consider it necessary.

Theological Questions.

A MARRIAGE QUESTION.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly answer in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD the following marriage question ?

“John — and Mary — went to service in St. Peter’s parish, and there acquired a quasi-domicile. They are both over twenty-one years of age, and make arrangements to get married, taking a house to live in after their marriage in the same parish (St. Peter’s). Their parents live in St. John’s parish, where they go and get married without the permission of the parish priest of St. Peter’s or his ordinary. Is the marriage valid ? The only difference between a quasi-domicile and a domicile is in the intention in the one case of for a notable time, and in the other of permanently dwelling in a place. These parties change their intention of temporary residence into that of permanent residence. Their quasi-domicile consequently becomes a domicile from the moment such change of intention takes place, even before they enter the new house. What say you on the question of validity of this marriage ? Yours, &c.,

“SACERDOS.”

A person might argue that the marriage of John and Mary was invalid ; that they had lost their parental domicile ; that the quasi-domicile which they had had in the parish of their service became a domicile when they purchased a home there, intending to reside in the parish permanently in future. Nevertheless, we consider that the marriage was valid, because—

I. Even supposing that they had acquired a *domicile* in the parish of their service, in St. Peter’s, it does not follow that they had lost their parental domicile. A person may have two domiciles. It seems pretty clear that John and Mary still regarded their parental homes as real homes to them ; that they were not mere visitors at home ; and that their connection with the homes of their parents was to be severed only through the actual celebration of marriage. Hence their marriage would be valid even if they had acquired a domicile in St. Peter’s parish,

II. But, moreover, we believe that they had not acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's parish before the celebration of their marriage. The difficulty against this view is this: When John and Mary went to service in St. Peter's, they acquired a *fixed habitation* in the parish; in the beginning they had the *intention* sufficient for a quasi-domicile; but when, intending to get married, they purchased a house for themselves, they changed their intention of temporary residence into an intention of permanent residence; hence it would appear that, prior to the marriage, they had acquired a domicile in the parish of their service.

We think, however, that they had not acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's parish prior to the celebration of their marriage. We do not argue from the change of residence. If they had had the *intention* of permanently residing in the parish prior to their withdrawal from the house of their employer, they would have acquired a domicile; because they would have commenced residence in *some* fixed abode in the parish (in their master's), and they would have had the intention of permanently residing in *some* fixed abode in the parish. We argue, therefore, from the absence of the intention, which is necessary for domicile. Intention, we must remember, is internal. Moreover, people do not formally express their intention; they do not always say: "I wish to reside permanently in this parish," or "I wish to reside in this parish for the greater part of a year;" hence we must try and determine a person's intention from his external acts and from the nature of his case. Now John and Mary must have had some intention of continuing to reside in St. Peter's parish, as they purchased a house there. But we contend that, from the very nature of the case, the intention was only conditional, and therefore insufficient for acquiring a domicile prior to the celebration of the marriage. We contend that the intention of dwelling in their new house, and of continuing to reside in St. Peter's parish was dependent on their marriage; and that if the marriage were frustrated they would not inhabit the newly purchased house, nor perhaps again revisit the parish. How then could it be said

that they had an absolute intention of permanently residing in St. Peter's? We conclude, therefore, that it was only through their marriage the quasi-domicile in St. Peter's was changed into a domicile; that they retained their paternal domicile up to the time of their marriage; and that they have been validly married.

D. COGHLAN.

Liturgical Questions.

INTENTIONS FOR THE DIVINE OFFICE—THE POPE'S DEBT.

"Expressions in the mouth of a priest such as: '*There, I have again discharged the Pope's debt*,' have given rise to controversy and difference of opinion amongst priests concerning the obligation to recite the Divine Office for the intentions of the Pope, or of the Church. In our handbooks on theology, treating on the subject, we find no express obligation laid down. The prayer "*Domine in unione*," &c. (before Office) is not explicit enough to settle a dispute, and only here and there, in such works as those of Lacroix, Gobat, Sporer, &c., do we find the question broached. I have not Gobat or Sporer, and in Lacroix I find the question very cursorily touched.

"May I ask you, in the interests of so many concerned, a double question:—

"Firstly, is it optional for a cleric, bound to the Divine Office, to recite it for any *private* intention.

"Secondly, if in the affirmative, does a choral recitation (*persolutio in choro*), impose any obligation to offer it for the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff, or for the wants of the Church, &c.?

"You may find it necessary to state clearly what constitutes a *private* or *public* recitation, especially as there appears some difference of definition amongst authors. If so, so much the better for a lucid understanding of the whole question.—I remain, very Rev. and dear Sir, yours faithfully.

U. E. U."

To our correspondent's first question we reply: Yes, quite lawful for one bound merely to the private recitation

the Divine Office to recite it for any special intention. Nay, more, not only is it lawful for him to have such an intention, but he is earnestly recommended by many ascetical writers always to recite the Office with the intention of gaining some special favour for himself or others. Thus writes Bacquez :—

“The character of public ambassador which the priest assumes whilst engaged in this function does not deprive him of the individuality of his action. He can always merit for himself ; he can always join to his prayer a personal intention, and thus apply it in a special manner to his own wants, or to the wants of those who are dear to him. . . . And if charity leads him to pray specially for some particular souls, or to join in his prayer the interests of others, what influence with God shall there not be found in the intercession of a man accustomed so often to approach Him, and speak to Him as it were heart to heart ?”¹

The theologians are here in agreement with the ascetics, though some of them attempt to make distinctions, which, however, have no foundation outside their own minds.

To the second question practically the same reply may be given. Beneficed clergymen bound to recite the Office in choir are, however, less free in this matter than others. It would be wrong for them to desire to apply the whole fruit of the Office to an individual ; for their obligation regarding the Office arises not merely from obedience, as in the case of others, but also from justice. They are, therefore, so to speak, the paid officials of the Church, and are consequently bound to discharge for the Church the duty of public worship which she owns to God, and also the duty of intercession and satisfaction, which she owes to her members generally. Hence, clergymen who enjoy a benefice on account of which they are obliged to the choral recitation of the Divine Office must give their suffrages to the Church, to be applied according to her intention. But, notwithstanding this, even these clergy may have a private intention, and may apply the fruits of their Office to themselves or others, in so far as they can without violating their obligations to the

¹ *The Divine Office*, translated by the Rev. E. L. Taunton, Book I., chapter 2.

Church. Thus Sporer, speaking of the intention which a beneficed clergyman should form, says: "*Quare licite et laudabiliter dices. Domine Deus hanc recitationem Officii offero quoad possum pro hoc particulari homine pro anima.*" These words are taken almost literally by Sporer from Gobat, and are quoted by other theologians as well.

The application of the fruits of the Divine Office would seem to be, as indeed it ought to be, analogous to the application of the fruits of the Mass. The priest celebrating the Most Holy Sacrifice acts as the representative of the Church, and necessarily applies to the members of the Church the general fruits of the Mass; nevertheless he can always apply what are called the *special fruits* to this or that individual, or can offer them for this or that intention. Now, it would appear to be indisputable that even a beneficed clergyman, bound to attendance in choir, has at least as much power, and as much right to make special application of part of the fruits accruing from the recital of the Divine Office, as the celebrant has regarding the special fruits of the Mass.

It should be distinctly understood that the intention of which we have spoken is not required for *validly* reciting the Office. The only intention necessary for the mere discharge of the obligation is implied in taking up one's breviary for the purpose of reading the Office. And even beneficiaries are not obliged to make any formal or explicit application.

The phrase to which our correspondent calls attention has always sounded harshly in our ears. It seems to lower very much the idea of the Divine Office; for it implies that in reciting the Office the cleric merely discharges an obligation imposed by the ecclesiastical authorities; whereas, in point of fact, apart altogether from the law of the Church, he engages in the most sublime and most fruitful form of prayer.

We have now answered our correspondent's questions, and we hope to his satisfaction, and have *not* found it necessary to define what is meant by *private*, what by *public* recital of the Office. To satisfy his curiosity, we may, however, state that by public recital is understood the recital in

choir by those who are bound to choir by reason of benefices. All other recital, whether in choir or out of it, whether by a single individual or by a number, *per modum chori*, is private.

Correspondence.

THE O'CURRY MSS.

“VERY REV. DEAR SIR,—I feel I owe a word of answer to the comment with which the Most Rev. Dr. Woodlock has honoured a statement of mine in the I. E. RECORD for November last. I said there that a MS. *Glossary* made by O'Curry had been supposed to be lost, until recently discovered in Clonliffe library.

“Immediately before this statement I had been going over the names and work of the leading Irish scholars of to-day, and I think I am right in saying that a reader of the paragraph would take as the meaning of my statement as to the MSS., that the whereabouts of this valuable work had been, until recently, unknown to Irish scholars. It was in January last that, through the courtesy of Very Rev. Canon Fitzpatrick, I took Dr. Kuno Meyer to see the *Glossary*. Dr. Meyer has been a worker in Irish literature for fifteen years, and has been in touch with the other Celtic scholars, and he never had heard of the whereabouts of this *Glossary*. As he said, its discovery was a revelation to him. And perhaps the best proof that it was a revelation to Irish scholars generally is, that, a fortnight afterwards, Dr. Whitley Stokes offered to publish the *Glossary* at his own expense. This is a most generous offer, for the publication of the huge collections of O'Curry would cost a very large sum.

“I think, then, that the word ‘discovered’ is not too strong. It is only right to add that the *Glossary*, and the other MSS. of O'Curry, are as safe in Clonliffe as they would be in the Royal Irish Academy, and perhaps safer. I trust, however, that the Most Rev. Dr. Woodlock's interest in them may lead to their examination and publication.—Very respectfully,

“EUGENE GROWNEY.”

FAST DAYS.

“VERY REV. SIR,—The very practical letter of “Cassiliensis” on the above subject, in your December issue, tempts me to make a suggestion, if, indeed, I may do so without impertinence.

“It is that, in order to avoid these oft-recurring and very embarrassing difficulties as to where certain customs prevail to the abrogation of the general law, our bishops would be pleased to frame and issue *one fixed indult for the whole of Ireland*, parish priests and confessors being left, as usual, free to deal with individual cases.

“As an argument in favour of this proposal, I may advance that the laity are very much astonished (to use no stronger phrase) at the wide differences which exist. These are at all times observable, especially in border parishes—as where, for instance, meat is allowed on Spy Wednesday in one diocese, but prohibited in the adjoining one. But the climax was reached last Lent, during the influenza epidemic, when in one diocese there was *no Lent at all*, and in its neighbour *no relaxation at all*.

“I suppose I shall be answered, that it depends altogether on the will of the bishops; but, surely, we would be doing them an injustice in assuming that they had no better principle to guide them than mere arbitrariness. Again, it may be argued that laws are framed differently for different places and peoples; and this, of course, I hold to be both wise and reasonable. Thus can conceive one Lenten law for France, and another for Germany; or even one for England, and another for Ireland; because, notwithstanding the ‘union of hearts,’ we differ essentially; but, surely, there can be no great difference between Irishmen in Donegal and in Cork, still less between Cork and Cloyne. I would, therefore, venture to express a hope that before next Lent comes on something may be done towards this much-to-be-desired unity of practice.

“And, as I speak of unity, might I here bring in just one other point on which it is greatly to be wished for; namely, the limitation of the Paschal or Easter time. In some dioceses it ends on Ascension Day, in others not until the Octave day of SS. Peter and Paul, as, no doubt, children have been not a little puzzled to observe when learning their Catechism. Would it not be well to strike the happy mean, and adopt *the Church’s own date*, viz.,

Trinity Sunday? Experience, I think, teaches that the more it is prolonged the more careless are the faithful in observing it. Yours in Christ.

“CLOYNENSIS.”

TEMPERANCE IN COUNTRY PARTS.

His Grace, the Most Rev. Dr. Ireland, is President of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of the United States. He is the most pronounced teetotaler in America, as well as one of the best friends of the Irish immigrant; and has been both for many a long day. On a recent occasion, writing on *Father Mathew's Work*, he calls out, appealingly to Father Mathew's countrymen. “Total Abstinence in Ireland,” he says, “is total abstinence across oceans, and over continents. And total abstinence in Ireland is to be had for the asking. God has not created a people more docile to their spiritual leaders than the children of St. Patrick.”¹

I wish to point out that temperance in Ireland—at least in the country parts—is to be had for the asking; and I am going to show how it was done, as a suggestion to others who are good and earnest, how they may go about it, leaving to themselves to improve upon it.

Shortly after Father Cullen, S.J., became the central organizer of the Apostleship of Prayer, and, as a means of furthering the interests of the Sacred Heart had established *The Irish Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, the present writer had a conversation with him. Knowing well Father Cullen's life-long devotion to the cause of temperance, and knowing what power to push forward his favourite doctrine he possessed in his position as head of the Apostleship of Prayer in Ireland, and editor of a religious magazine, the question at once came under discussion. He was waiting merely to obtain a certain circulation,² and then, with all his heart and soul, he would throw himself into the work. That time came, and he kept his word.

Father Cullen's method of meeting the grave and crying evil of intemperance, I believe to be the best adapted to the Irish temperament. His idea is—make a sacrifice for the love of God, and the good of your neighbour. It does not matter whether you are a drinking person or not. Drunkenness is a sin against

¹ See October Number (1890) of *Catholic World*.

² Price of Magazine, One Penny.—Office, 5, Gt. Denmark-st., Dublin.

God ; God is offended ; so come, and be on God's side ; make a sacrifice for God's sake ; make reparation for the injury done Him ; you do a thing pleasing to God, and the anger of God will be appeased.

This idea of sacrifice for the love of God, and sacrifice on this particular point, has been put forward, month after month, in the little journal of the Sacred Heart, with pathos, with piety, and with (thank God) conviction and success.

Undoubtedly, one of the greatest helps to the introduction of temperance into a parish is the spread of this little journal, as advocating the cause of temperance. It would be well—but this is not directly on the subject—to try and establish the devotion to the Sacred Heart. The spirit of that devotion is a spirit of sacrifice ; and the people, being imbued with that spirit, will more readily listen to the pleadings for sacrifice in favour of temperance ; especially, when they are asked to do so because of their love of the Sacred Heart.

With the aid of one or two promoters, and with a few simple exhortations from the altar, two hundred numbers or so became circulated through the parish. From time to time, attention was called to what Father Cullen mentioned or recommended in *The Messenger*. It became more serious in the eyes of the people when it was read to them at Mass out of a book ; and when they went home they looked at it, and read it over ; and it thus became much more impressed on their minds, and had much greater effect on their way of thinking, than if they had but cursorily read it over themselves. The opinions of the eminent doctors, given in the little journal, had the greatest weight ; and the minds and hearts of the people were moved by the simple letters and pathetic appeals that appeared from correspondents who were suffering from the misery of drink in their houses.

Proceeding, then, on Father Cullen's lines, there began to be talk about taking the pledge, making a sacrifice for the love of the Sacred Heart ; and on the part of those whose business or habits of life would not permit them to take the total abstinence pledge, that they would, at least, confine themselves strictly to a very limited quantity—to two drinks in the day, when occasion would necessitate it, and on no account to go beyond that.

The next thing was to give this good feeling outward figure and shape. I confess there was at this point a good deal of hesitation. Up to this it was all talk ; at best it was but preparation.

A body was free to go on, or retire, or stand still, whichever a body liked, because as yet there was no committing of oneself to any definite thing. But now a move was to be made, when one had to come out from covert, and to take up position in the open; and then, if failure came, there was no covering a retreat; and the cause would have suffered rather than gained. It was, therefore, after a good deal of weighing and considering, that the following plan was adopted:—

I had seen children, over and over again, sell bazaar tickets. I saw that they were not ashamed to challenge anyone; that no one resented their importunity; and that they succeeded where others, in all probability, would have failed. This was a lesson to me. I shall ask the little children, I said, to be young apostles of temperance. Very few, if any, will refuse them; and the canvassing will have the effect of making the little pets stauncher abstainers themselves more than any amount of lecturing could do. I went to the schools. I asked for volunteers. Both boys and girls, of the adult classes, readily entered into the spirit of the movement; they would be teetotalers themselves, and would cheerfully, for the sake of the Sacred Heart, enrol others. Prizes were promised to the first who would bring in a list of fifteen names, to the second, the third, and so on, and hand them to the teachers. Next morning there was a race to the school with their lists; one boy met myself on the road with a list of seventeen; and a little girl with a list of twenty-three. We began the first day with something over a hundred. A gross of medals were at once ordered. For those who took the total abstinence pledge for twelve months we attached a green ribbon to the medal; for those who "limited themselves" to two drinks, a red ribbon was provided. Ribbon, fastening-pin, and medal, all sold for three-pence. In come the children, their slips of papers full of names, and their little hands full of money for the medals. It was a sight to make a man happy, to see the gravity and business-like manner of these dear children; one could barely muster words to say:—"God bless them! God bless them!" A second gross of medals was ordered, and they went; a third was ordered, and it did not do; a fourth is now on its way to extinction; and the poor children did it all.

In conjunction with the broad parish temperance movement, a club-room was started for the men and boys of the little village and the surrounding district. This, again, was attempted only

after great hesitation. The difficulty was manifold: where to get a suitable room or set of rooms; who to take care of it; should a coffee-room be started with it? would it be attended? would it last. All these difficulties kept waving me back, and I was all but literally forced into it.

I spoke hesitatingly to a few; and though they returned words of hope, I still had misgivings. At last a preliminary meeting was called. It was explained to them what was intended—I must say, not, indeed, with a great deal of detail, for as yet the plan did not exist in my own mind in form and detail. To cover my own weakness, I said, with diplomacy, that a great deal would depend on the number that would join; and then and there members were invited to join. I may say, at the outset, that we invited no one but the labouring people and artisans. Boys were to be admitted from once they began to work as employed hands, and to earn for themselves. Children going to school were excluded.

The first night we got thirty-seven to join. I thought we would not have got beyond thirty permanent members; and with thirty I was willing to make a venture. Before we broke up we elected officers, formed a committee, engaged a house, and gave orders for furniture. Next Sunday night we were to enter on our own new premises, and receive contributions.

The contribution or subscription was a thing that, because of the poor people, I was anxious to keep as low as possible; and I therefore suggested one penny a-week. "Two pence," "two pence," was cried out by several; and while I was demurring, one young man proposed that it be sixpence a month; *i.e.*, about $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ a-week. This I agreed to, pointing out to some of the men, whom I knew well, that it was only three bottles of porter for the whole month, and that we would guarantee to give better value for the money.

There was one thing on the very first night that we had a short, but serious (and, I believe, valuable) dispute about. One of the conditions of the two-drink pledge was, that no drink was to be taken in any of the public-houses in our village, or in any of the premises near or about these public-houses. I note this, because I found it a very useful, if not the most useful, regulation in the whole programme. They at once gave me precedent where, if a man were free to take two drinks, he might take it in his own village. I saw that Sunday was the only day that the men or boys of the neighbourhood took drink in the village public-

houses, and I felt that if I had secured Sunday, I had virtually secured total abstinence. In this matter, I think that cities and country places stand on different footing. Country people never think of going into a public-house ordinarily on a week day; in fact, there is a silent public opinion against the matter; the man that would do it would be looked upon as having an insatiable thirst for it—to use their own language—“give him up; he is gone.” In cities, the shop is next door: people turn in at any moment of the day, week-day as well as Sunday; and there is no such feeling about it as there is in the country. In this way I regard country places as different from towns.

Finding myself cornered by the precedent they laid down, and also by the expression of their opinion, which one man voiced by saying, “We are all for it, Father,” to which I answered, “All right; but I’m against it, Johnnie,” I had to give some reason for my action; and the best argument that came into my head at the moment was this:—“I would be wrong, if I asked of you anything that was unreasonable. Now, suppose a man was going a journey of a Sunday—suppose to such a town (nine or ten miles away), or to such a town (twelve or fifteen miles away)—and suppose he wanted to eat or drink, I would be unreasonable if I wanted to prevent that man from taking a drink, where he had leave to take two. But here at home, you walk out, and go to Mass, and return again. Now, is it not the height of selfishness and indulgence for that man to go into a public-house, and drink his porter or ale?” “Oh! begor, very well so, as your Reverence is *agin* it, we won’t, boys; we won’t.” Chorus, “We won’t.” That settled the matter. The boys and men have kept to it religiously. This very day, as I write, a meeting was held in our village; and some of the sports were held in a field of one of the publicans (*entre nous*, the publicans are at the bottom of sports and meetings); and the sergeant of the police has just told me that he or the men didn’t see one of the boys of the neighbourhood go into the public-house, or into any one in the village. The members themselves keep watch on one another. Three or four of them of the same townland have a suspicion that one or two are thinking of backsliding; they at once set a watch on them; the others, in turn, begin to suspect, and, willingly or unwillingly, keep straight. The games, then, of the house meet that longing for novelty and association and amusement that was the prime cause in other days of attracting them to the public-house.

At our first meeting we invited those who were able to pay a two-months', a quarterly, a half-yearly, or a yearly subscription, according as it was convenient. So many new members had given in their names during the first week, and so generously did all subscribe, that we were able to pay for the amount of furniture we had ordered, as well as clear off all such little debts as lamps, oil, games, papers, &c. Playing-cards is the game most sought after—each pack of cards engaging six persons; it is apparent that cards give the largest enjoyment with the least expense. At the beginning, I said that I wished that they would not play for any stake higher than a penny. "Oh! no, your Reverence, we never play higher than a halfpenny a man."

In the third week, we were neck-and-neck with a hundred. In the fourth week we got to about one hundred and twenty, and we have reached a maximum of between one hundred and thirty and a hundred and forty. Count on one hundred and twenty steady members, at 6*d.* per month, that is £3 a month. Now our expenses are—house rent, 5*s.* a month; oil, about 5*s.* a month; playing-cards, about 5*s.* a month; and during the winter months, coal has to be added. We get the daily papers, three or four weekly ones—all of which we get re-bought at very nearly half-cost; and friends supply us with numbers of the picture papers, such as *The Graphic*, *The Illustrated News*, &c. The members seem quite happy, and enjoy themselves as gaily as children. I thought, at first, that my presence would be required there continually; not at all; that was another of the bug-bears that frightened me. It is not far from the Presbytery, and I manage to call in every night, as a rule; but I see no necessity for so doing; at the same that I regard it as useful.

I have to make a confession. I thought I knew the country parts as well as anyone, and I would have flatly contradicted anybody that told me there was need (not to say pressing need) for a temperance association there; in common phrase "I would have run my finger into his eye." I was wrong; I see it now. How did I come to see it? Fathers and mothers, and brothers and friends, blessing the movement, speaking of peace and happiness where they had not been, and begging of the God of mercy and of domestic peace to bless and preserve the movement, and to give it staying power to continue and to prosper.

A COUNTRY PRIEST.

Documents.

EXORCISMUS IN SATANAM ET ANGELOS APOSTATICOS IUSSU
LEONIS XIII. P. M. EDITUS.

In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Exsurgat Deus, et dissipentur inimici eius : et fugiant qui oderunt eum a facie eius.

Sicut deficit fumus, deficiant ; sicut fluit cera a facie ignis, sic pereant peccatores a facie Dei. (Ps. lxxvii.)

Iudica, Domine, nocentes me ; expugna impugnantes me.

Confundantur et revereantur quaerentes animam meam.

Avertantur retrorsum, et confundantur cogitantes mihi mala.

Fiant tamquam pulvis ante faciem venti : et angelus Domini coarctans eos.

Fiat via illorum tenebrae, et lubricum : et angelus Domini persequens eos.

Quoniam gratis absconderunt mihi interitum laquei sui : super-vacue exprobraverunt animam meam.

Veniat illi laqueus quem ignorat ; et captio quam abscondit, apprehendat eum : et in laqueum cadat in ipsum.

Anima autem mea exsultabit in Domino : et delectabitur super salutari suo. (Ps. xxxiv.)

Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto :

Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

AD S. MICHAELEM ARCHANGELUM,
PRECATIO.

Princeps gloriosissime caelestis militiae, sancte Michael Archangele, defende nos in praelio et *colluctatione*, quae nobis est *adversus principes et potestates, adversus mundi rectores tenebrarum harum, contra spiritualia nequitiae, in caelestibus.* (Ephes. vi.) Veni in auxilium hominum ; quos *Deus creavit inexterminabiles, et ad imaginem similitudinis suae fecit, et a tyrannide diaboli emit pretio magno.* (Sap. ii., 1 Cor. vi.) Praeliare hodie cum beatorum Angelorum exercitu praelia Domini, sicut pugnasti olim contra ducem superbiae luciferum, et angelos eius apostaticos ; *et non valuerunt, neque locus inventus est eorum amplius in caelo.* Sed *proiectus est draco ille magnus, serpens antiquus, qui vocatur diabolus et satanas, qui seducit universum orbem ; et proiectus est in terram, et angeli eius cum illo missi sunt.* (Apoc. xii.) En

antiquus inimicus et *homicida* vehementer erectus est. Transfiguratus in angelum lucis, cum tota malignorum spirituum caterva late circuit et invadit terram, ut in ea deleat nomen Dei et Christi eius, animasque ad aeternae gloriae coronam destinatas furetur, mactet ac perdat in sempiternum interitum. Virus nequitiae suae, tamquam flumen immundissimum, draco maleficus transfundit in homines depravatos mente et corruptos corde; spiritum mendacii, impietatis et blasphemiae; halitumque mortiferum luxuriae, vitiorum omnium et iniquitatum. Ecclesiam, Agni immaculati sponsam, vaferrimi hostes repleverunt amaritudinibus, inebriarunt absinthio; ad omnia desiderabilia eius impias miserunt manus. Ubi sedes beatissimi Petri et Cathedra veritatis ad lucem gentium constituta est ibi thronum posuerunt abominationis impietatis suae; ut percusso Pastore, et gregem disperdere valeant. Adesto itaque, Dux invictissime, populo Dei contra irrumpentes spirituales nequitias, et fac victoriam. Te custodem et patronum sancta veneratur Ecclesia; te gloriatur defensore adversus terrestrium et infernorum nefarias potestates; tibi tradidit Dominus animas redemptorum in superna felicitate locandas. Deprecare Deum pacis, ut conterat satanam sub pedibus nostris, ne ultra valeat captivos tenere homines, et Ecclesiae nocere. Offer nostras preces in conspectu Altissimi, ut cito anticipent nos misericordiae Domini, et apprehendas draconem, serpentem antiquum, qui est diabolus et satanas, ac ligatum mittas in abyssum, *ut non seducat amplius gentes.* (Apoc. xx.)

Hinc tuo confisi praesidio ac tutela, sacra ministerii nostri auctoritate, ad infestationes diabolicae fraudis repellendas in nomine Iesu Christi Dei et Domini nostri fidentis et securi aggredimur.

V. Ecce Crucem Domini, fugite partes adversae.

R. Vicit Leo de tribu Iuda, radix David.

V. Fiat misericordia tua, Domine, super nos.

R. Quemadmodum speravimus in te.

V. Domine, exaudi orationem meam.

R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.

V. Dominus vobiscum.

R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

OREMUS.

Deus, et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, invocamus nomen sanctum tuum, et clementiam tuam supplices exposcimus ut, per intercessionem immaculatae semper virginis Dei genitricis Mariae

beati Michaelis Archangeli, beati Ioseph eiusdem beatæ Virginis Sponsi, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli et omnium Sanctorum, adversus satanam, omnesque alios immundos spiritus, qui ad nocendum humano generi animasque perdendas pervagantur in mundo, nobis auxilium præstare digneris. Per eundem Christum Dominum Nostrum. Amen.

EXORCISMUS.

Exorcizamus te, omnis immunde spiritus, omnis satanica potestas, omnis incursio infernalis adversarii, omnis legio, omnis congregatio et secta diabolica, in nomine et virtute Domini nostri Iesu ✠ Christi, eradicare et effugare a Dei Ecclesia, ab animabus ad imaginem Dei conditis ac pretioso divini Agni sanguine redemptis ✠. Non ultra audeas, serpens callidissime, decipere humanum genus, Dei Ecclesiam persequi, ac Dei electos excutere et cribrare sicut triticum ✠. Imperat tibi Deus altissimus ✠, cui in magna tua superbia te similem haberi adhuc præsumis; *qui omnes homines vult salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire.* (1 Tim. ii.) Imperat tibi Deus Pater ✠; imperat tibi Deus Filius ✠; imperat tibi Deus Spiritus Sanctus ✠. Imperat tibi maiestas Christi, æternum Dei Verbum caro factum ✠, qui pro salute generis nostri tua invidia perdit, *humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem* (Phil. ii.); qui Ecclesiam suam aedificavit supra firmam petram, et portas inferi adversus eam nunquam esse prævalituras edixit, cum ea ipse permansurus *omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi.* (Matt. xxviii. 20.) Imperat tibi sacramentum Crucis ✠, omniumque christianæ fidei Mystericrum virtus ✠. Imperat tibi excelsa Dei Genitrix Virgo Maria ✠, quæ superbissimum caput tuum a primo instanti immaculatae suæ conceptionis in sua humilitate contrivit. Imperat tibi fides sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, et ceterorum Apostolorum ✠. Imperat tibi Martyrum sanguis, ac pia Sanctorum et Sanctarum omnium intercessio ✠.

Ergo, draco malediete et omnis legio diabolica, adiuramus te per Deum ✠ vivum, per Deum verum, per Deum ✠ sanctum per Deum qui *sic . . . dilexit mundum, ut Filium suum unigenitum daret ut omnis qui credit in eum non pereat, sed habeat vitam æternam* (Io. iii.): cessa decipere humanas creaturas, eisque æternæ perditionis venenum propinare: desine Ecclesiae nocere, et eius libertati laqueos iniicere. Vade satana, inventor et magister omnis fallaciae, hostis humanæ salutis. Da locum Christo, in quo nihil invenisti de operibus tuis; da locum Ecclesiae uni, sanctae, catholicae, et Apostolicae, quam Christus ipse acquisivit

sanguine tuo. Humiliare sub potenti manu Dei; contremisce et effuge, invocato a nobis sancto et terribili nomine Iesu, quem inferi tremunt, cui Virtutes caelorum et Potestates et Dominationes subiectae sunt; quem Cherubim et Seraphim indefessis vocibus laudant, dicentes: Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth.

V. Domine, exaudi orationem meam.

R. Et clamor meus ad te veniat.

V. Dominus vobiscum.

R. Et cum spiritu tuo.

OREMUS.

Deus caeli, Deus terrae, Deus Angelorum, Deus Archangelorum, Deus Patriarcharum, Deus Prophetarum, Deus Apostolorum, Deus Martyrum, Deus Confessorum, Deus Virginum, Deus qui potestatem habes donare vitam post mortem, requiem post laborem; quia non est Deus praeter te, nec esse potest nisi tu creator omnium visibilium et invisibilium, cuius regni non erit finis: humiliter maiestati gloriae tuae supplicamus, ut ab omni infernalium spirituum potestate, laqueo, deceptione et nequitia nos potenter liberare, et incolumes custodire digneris. Per Christum Dominum Nostrum. Amen.

Ab insidiis diaboli, libera nos, Domine.

Ut Ecclesiam tuam secunda tibi facias libertate servire; Te rogamus, audi nos.

Ut inimicos sanctae Ecclesiae humiliare digneris; Te rogamus, audi nos.

(Et aspergatur locus aqua benedicta.)

ADDITION TO THE UNIVERSAL CALENDAR OF THE FEASTS OF
S. JOHN DAMASCENE, DOCTOR (27TH MARCH); S. SILVESTER,
ABBOT (26TH NOVEMBER); AND S. JOHN OF CAPISTRANO,
CONFESSOR (28TH MARCH).

ADDITION TO THE 6TH LESSON OF THE OFFICE OF THE
SACRED HEART.

DECRETUM URBIS ET ORBIS.

Quod iam pridem erat in votis Christifidelium Catholici Orbis, ut celebraretur ubique memoria Sanctorum Confessorum Ioannis Damasceni, Silvestri Abbatis et Ioannis a Capistrano, quorum primus pro ea qua inclaruit praestantia doctrinae, alteri pro apostolicis operibus, quibus animarum saluti profuerunt, Ecclesiam Dei mirifice illustrarunt; id nostra hac aetate plurimum

sacrorum Antistitum, ac Virorum dignitate insignium ingeminatis precibus a Romana Sede enixius postulatum est.

Hinc eiusmodi supplicibus votis libenter obsecundans Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII rem omnem commissam voluit maturo examini et iudicio Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis; quae in Ordinario Coetu coadunata, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Augustino Caprara Sanctae Fidei Promotore, petitam Festorum extensionem ad universalem Ecclesiam ita concedi posse censuit, nimirum ut de S. Ioanne Damasceno Confessore fiat die XXVII Martii sub ritu duplici minori, addita *Doctoris* qualitate; de S. Silvestro Abbate, die XXVI Novembris sub eodem ritu; ac demum de S. Ioanne a Capistrano Confessore agatur die XXVIII Martii sub ritu semiduplici. Respectiva tamen Officia cum Missis de enuntiatis Sanctorum Festis, cura ipsius Sacrae Congregationis quantocius fieri possit edenda, anno millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo secundo ab omnibus qui e Clero tam Saeculari quam Regulari ad Horas Canonicas tenentur, in posterum recitanda sunt: servatis Rubricis.

Insuper iidem Eñi ac Rñi Patres sacris tuendis Ritibus Praepositi decernendum putarunt, ut sexta lectio Officii de Sacratissimo Corde Iesu cuius Festum ab eodem Sanctissimo Domino Nostro ad ritum Duplicis primae classis anno superiore pro universa Ecclesia evectum est, deinceps ita concludatur, videlicet:

“Quam caritatem Christi patientis et pro generis humani redemptione morientis, atque in suae mortis commemorationem instituentis sacramentum corporis et sanguinis sui, ut fideles sub sanctissimi Cordis symbolo devotius ac ferventius recolant, eiusdemque fructus uberius percipiant, Clemens Decimus tertius *ipsius sacratissimi Cordis festum nonnullis Ecclesiis celebrare concessit, Pius Nonus ad universam extendit Ecclesiam, ac denique Summus Pontifex Leo Decimus tertius, orbis catholici votis obsecundans, ad ritum Duplicis primae classis evexit.*”

Sanctitas porro Sua, relationem mei infrascripti Cardinalis Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecti, sententiam ipsius Sacrae Congregationis in omnibus ratam habens et confirmans, memorata tria Festa sub enuntiato ritu statisque diebus ad universam Ecclesiam extendit, simulque praefatam additionem ad calcem supradictae lectionis in Officio Sacri Cordis Iesu approbare dignata est. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die XIX Augusti MDCCCXC.

CAIETANUS Card. ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI, *S. R. C. Secretarius.*

Notices of Books.

JOHN MACHALE, ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM: HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND CORRESPONDENCE. Two Vols. By Right Reverend Bernard O'Reilly, D.D., D. Lit.; Laval: Domestic Prelate of His Holiness. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati. 1890.

FEW works have issued from the press during the present century of more engrossing interest for Irishmen, at home and abroad, than Dr. O'Reilly's Life of "The Great Archbishop of the West." Born in the year 1791, when most of the nations of Europe were on the eve of a revolution which was destined to make itself felt in the remotest corners of the world, and his own country lay still in darkness, covered with a pall of ignorance which the penal legislation of two hundred years had woven around her, John MacHale attained the age of manhood while the struggle for Catholic Emancipation was yet in its infancy, and a demand for justice to Ireland in the matter of education had not entered into the programme of any practical politician of the time. But these movements were destined to progress with the advancement of freedom and enlightenment; and just when most needed to direct them, to guide them on the secure lines of rectitude and truth, the great Prelate whom God seemed to have raised up for that special purpose, took his position in the forefront of ecclesiastical and political life. Appearing before the public for the first time in 1820, when, under the pseudonym of *Hierophilus*, he wrote his famous letters from Maynooth, against the apologists of Gibbon and the promoters of the Biblical Propaganda of the Kildare-street Society, John of Tuam continued from that date until his death, in 1881, to be the inspiring genius of every great movement for the religious, social, and political well-being of his country. The intimate friend of O'Connell, he remained his most trusted adviser and co-operator in the promotion of his vast schemes for Emancipation, the abolition of Tithes, the reform of the Franchise, and Repeal. The recognised spokesman of the great majority of Irish Catholics on the burning question of education, he corresponded with the ministers of the Crown in a tone of conscious strength and authority, that compelled, if not acquiescence, at

least a salutary respect and fear. The unflinching advocate of integrity in political warfare, through every phase of its protean development, he remained, from first to last, an uncompromising enemy of place-hunters and pledge-breakers, and a staunch supporter of the policy of independent opposition which was realized at a later date. The high-souled and single-minded ecclesiastic, he proved himself, while the iron frame and gigantic intellect of his earlier manhood yet remained with him, a brilliant ornament of the sanctuary, a tower of strength to his episcopal brethren, and a fountain of sympathy and mercy to the suffering and the poor. If at times he held strong views in opposition to men of equal dignity and entitled to equal respect, his attitude on such occasions was the result of firm conviction, begotten of the earnestness of his Celtic nature ; and though not unfrequently a source of embarrassment to his more pacific brethren of the episcopate, it generally resulted, as will now be freely admitted, in obtaining from their rulers more beneficent measures for the Irish people, and commanding more respect and influence for the Irish bishops themselves. These several phases of Dr. MacHale's life and character will be found depicted in bold lines and clear colouring in the narrative which Dr. O'Reilly unfolds to us in his intensely interesting work.

That Dr. O'Reilly was admirably fitted even for the herculean task which such a biography as this imposed upon him, we had not the smallest doubt. His *Mirror of True Womanhood*, and the essays that, from time to time, have appeared in various periodicals from his pen—all written in an easy, graceful style, and bearing evidence of erudition—had prepared us to expect that the latest work entrusted to him would be ably and satisfactorily accomplished. We regret our expectations have not been fully realized. No doubt, the author gives proof in these pages of a clear, capacious mind and calm judgment. No doubt, before entering on his labours he had mastered the outlines of Irish history—political, social and ecclesiastical—during the last hundred years, and was, therefore, in a position to appreciate the influence of the great archbishop on the movements in which he figured, and the impress he succeeded in making on the character of his time. No doubt, too, he shows an intimate acquaintance with the intricate machinery by which the Church accomplishes her mission, and seems to recognise the difficulty of working an organization, divine in its origin, its constitution, and its end,

through the employment of merely human means. And all this knowledge, one would think, should have enabled him to deal with his subject, important and delicate though it was, without indulging in language calculated to give offence in any quarter, or without betraying feelings which can only prove a stumbling-block to many for whom this biography has been written. Yet this Dr. O'Reilly has not succeeded in doing. He has detailed in these volumes many features of Church government of a purely esoteric character, which, however entertaining and instructive an exhaustive account of them may prove to canonists and theologians, yet should certainly not appear in a book intended for the general public. Possibly some extenuation for this may be found in the fact that it is characteristic of the American mind to place everything above board; but where the spiritual good of the faithful is exposed to serious danger by detailing *the whole truth* ordinary prudence should dictate that even the historian should be satisfied with telling only *the truth*.

There is another feature of Dr. O'Reilly's work upon which we feel bound to animadvert even in stronger terms than those we have hitherto employed. To facilitate the author's labours, he had placed at his disposal the voluminous manuscript correspondence bequeathed by the late archbishop to his nephew, the Very Rev. Thomas MacHale, D.D., of the Irish College, Paris. Among the numerous letters contained in this collection there are many of an essentially private character, written by the Irish bishops to one another, or to the Prefect of the Propaganda, at times when important ecclesiastical questions were under discussion, and when the opinions of individual prelates were solicited in circumstances demanding the utmost secrecy, and considerations of the highest moment demanded a conscientious expression of their convictions without hesitation or reserve. Now, we make bold to assert, without fear of contradiction, that the illustrious archbishop himself should never have felt justified during life in giving these documents to the public; and, therefore, we hold it a breach of the most sacred confidence to publish them after his death. It is an injustice, as well to the distinguished prelate himself as to those who trusted in his honour. And this injustice is aggravated by giving them to the world at a time when ecclesiastical authority cannot deport itself with too much dignity, nor surround itself with too much prestige derived from its successes in the past. Of course it is possible that, in this

matter, Dr. O'Reilly was not absolutely his own master; but until he dissociates himself from the responsibility, at his door it must lie. If such licence were tolerated in the general public, as the author of these volumes boldly arrogates to himself, the most sacred relations of society should soon be rent asunder, and mutual confidence and friendship could no longer exist among men.

On the admirable manner in which the bookbinders and printers have discharged their duties in the production of Dr. O'Reilly's work, we cannot bestow too much praise. The fourteen hundred pages of sized paper, printed with clear type, and profusely illustrated with steel engravings of some of the most beautiful scenery of the West of Ireland, are bound in two magnificent volumes, with gilt edges and richly ornamented covers. The work, though expensive, is certainly not dear; and, if the serious blemishes to which we have called attention had been avoided, these would certainly be for Irishmen the two most profoundly interesting volumes that the present century has produced.

J. J. C.

ONE AND THIRTY DAYS WITH BLESSED MARGARET MARY.

From the French. By a Visitandine of Baltimore.

THIS little book of thirty-one meditations on the virtues practised by Blessed Margaret Mary, on her love of God, and on her devotion to the Sacred Heart, can be used with special profit during the month of June or the month of October. The thoughts in each consideration are very striking, and the Spiritual Bouquet at the end of each meditation consists of a beautiful prayer or short reflection in the words of Blessed Margaret Mary.

ST. BASIL'S HYMN BOOK. ST. BASIL'S HYMNAL.

THESE books will be found very useful for the promotion of congregational singing. The former, in addition to the prayers ordinarily found in prayer-books, contains close on two hundred hymns in English, and the Little Office of the Immaculate Conception, in Latin and English. The latter, in addition to the music for these numerous hymns, contains the tones of the psalms at Vespers, the music of many Liturgical hymns, of three Masses, and of the funeral service. The *Hymnal* is very accurately and clearly printed on beautifully toned paper.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

FEBRUARY, 1891.

THE "STOWE MISSAL."

THE *Stowe Missal* is certainly the most valuable and interesting liturgical monument of the early Church of Ireland that has come down to our times ; and some very competent authorities have even gone so far as to say that no more important document, from a liturgical point of view, has been preserved in any of the Western Churches. From a dogmatic point of view it is hardly less interesting and less important ; so that both theologians and historians owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. MacCarthy for the admirable account of this invaluable literary treasure, which he has published in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*,¹ at the request of that learned body. There are few people indeed, if any, so well qualified to accomplish that task as Dr. MacCarthy ; and he has certainly spared no pains in the discharge of the duty imposed on him by the Academy.

It is to be feared, however, that a knowledge of the *Transactions of the Academy* is confined to a very limited number ; and besides, Dr. MacCarthy, from the very nature of his task, was more or less confined to the literary and antiquarian aspects of his subject. It may be interesting therefore, to the general reader, to give a more popular

¹ A paper read before the Royal Irish Academy, by the Rev. B. MacCarthy, D.D., 8th of June, 1885 ; and published in vol. xxvii. of the *Transactions* for 1886.

summary of some of the interesting questions connected with the *Stowe Missal*.

That name itself is a curious misnomer, for the only connection the manuscript had with Stowe is that it was preserved there for some time in the library of the Duke of Buckingham; and, as Eugene Curry bitterly complained, its churlish and illiberal owners never allowed any Irish scholar except their own librarian to examine the *Missal*. Fortunately the MS. has since come into the possession of the Royal Irish Academy, and is now available for examination by competent scholars.

It appears from the inscriptions on the outer shrine or cover, which contains the precious MS., that the volume was enshrined about the middle of the eleventh century. This work was executed at the joint expense of Macraith, king of Cashel, whose death is recorded by *The Four Masters* in A.D. 1052, and of Donchad or Donogh, the son of Brian Boru, who is described as King of Ireland at that time, but who was dethroned some ten years later for the alleged fratricide of his brother Tadgh.¹ The shrine was re-decorated at a later period by Philip O'Kennedy, king of Ormond, and his wife Anne, both of whom died in 1381. This goes to show that the precious volume enclosed within the shrine originally belonged to some monastery in O'Kennedy's territory of Lower Ormond—most probably either to the monastery of Tir-da-Glas or of Lothra, both of which were very celebrated in ancient times.

The volume itself is a small square quarto, now containing sixty-five folios, bound in oaken boards, covered with

¹ Dr. MacCarthy begins his essay by correcting an "error" of the two learned Doctors Todd and O'Connor, for which he alleges Mac Firbis was primarily responsible. These authorities made Donogh responsible for the murder of his brother, by translating the Irish phrase, *iar na umhaill dia brathar*, "having been instigated by his brother;" whereas Dr. MacCarthy alleges that the true text is *iar n-a umal dia brathair*, which he renders, "after submission to his brother." Perhaps Dr. MacCarthy has not adverted to the fact, that in the *Chronicon Scotorum* (page 263) the words are *iar na erail do Donnachadh*, which Hennessy translates, "at the desire of Donnachadh," taking *erail* for *uail*, which he shows from the Bodleian copy to be the true reading of 'Tighernach, and which also seems to give the true meaning.

leather. Nine of the folios appear to have been inserted at a date subsequent to the original binding of the volume. The contents comprise the following tracts:—First, certain portions of the Gospel of St. John; then the *Missal* proper; next a ritual containing the Ordo Baptismi, the Visitation of the Sick, with the prayers for the administration of the Viaticum and of Extreme Unction; then there is a Tract on the Mass in Irish; and lastly, three Charms or Spells, also in Irish—showing how closely superstition follows in the track of what is best and holiest in religion. It is quite evident, therefore, that this volume served the double purpose of a missal and of a ritual for the clergy of the church in which it was preserved, and that some of them also inserted the unauthorized prayers and ceremonies which were supposed to be efficacious for working certain cures, and which certainly appear to savour of superstition.

Of the name of the first scribe we have no information of any kind, except what is given in an Ogham score, inserted in one of the extracts from the Gospel of St. John, which appears to give the name of the scribe, and which, if read from left to right, would be Sonid; but if from right to left, it would be Dinos. The former is probably the true reading; but of the individual thus named nothing else is known.

The inserted folios were written at a much later period than the original by a scribe who calls himself Maelcaigh, and who is supposed to have flourished about the middle of the eighth century. Dr. MacCarthy gives a reference from *The Book of Lismore* to the genealogy of a certain Maelcaigh, who belonged to the Dalcassian race, and who seems to have been connected with the barony of Lower Ormond. It is not unlikely that this Dalcassian was the second scribe who gives his own name in the MS.

Dr. MacCarthy agrees with the late Dr. Todd, who thought that the MS. was written in a character "which might well be deemed older than the sixth century." We need not, however, assume that the MS. is older than those religious houses in Lower Ormond, to some of which it most probably belonged. Now Lorrha was founded about 550, and

Terryglass some two years earlier, so that if the *Missal* and *Ritual* belonged to either of these establishments, it was most probably written about the middle of the sixth century. The ornamentation and enshrining of the MS. show that it must have been regarded with more than the ordinary reverence due to sacred works, and we know that very often this arose from the fact that the work was either written by a sainted founder or sanctified by his use.

Both Columba of Terryglass and Ruadhan of Lorrha were Munster saints, and belonged to that second Order of the saints who received a mass from the venerable Fathers of the Welsh Church; so that if this *Missal* belonged to either of them, it most probably represents that revision of the liturgy which the Welsh saints introduced into the Irish Church of the sixth century. This view will be further borne out by a careful examination of the few historical references to this subject that have come down to our times.

There is a very interesting document, first published by Spelman, and more recently by Haddan and Stubbs, which purports to give an account of the origin of the Roman, Gallican, and Irish liturgies. The author seems to have been an Irish monk of the monastery of Bobbio, in Italy, who flourished shortly after the death of Attala, its second abbot, in the year A.D. 627. It is true that the Irish monk only speaks of the *cursus* which corresponds with the word "office," as used in our own time; but then, as now, the rule was that the mass corresponded with the office, and hence what is said of *cursus* may be understood of the entire liturgy, including the mass.

According to this ancient and apparently trustworthy document, the Roman *cursus*, or liturgy of St. Peter and St. Paul, was first introduced into Gaul by Trophimus, first bishop of Arles, and Photinus, first bishop of Lyons, who were themselves disciples of St. Peter, and therefore familiar with the liturgy of the Roman Church.

But Photinus was martyred, as Eusebius tells us, with forty-seven companions, and was succeeded in the See of Lyons by St. Irenæus about the year A.D. 177. Now St. Irenæus was a disciple of St. Polycarp, who being himself a

disciple of St. John, naturally adopted the liturgy of that Apostle as practised in the Churches of Asia Minor. Through the influence of St. Irenæus and his successors this liturgy appears to have been very generally adopted in Gaul, and seems to have been in some respects quite different from the Roman liturgy of St. Peter and St. Paul.

But this Gallican liturgy, introduced and widely propagated by St. Irenæus, was itself subsequently displaced—at least to some extent—by the Alexandrine liturgy of St. Mark. It was brought about in this way. The celebrated John Cassian, an eastern monk, had spent many years in Egypt, in close communion with the Fathers of the desert, carefully observing their discipline, their maxims, and their manner of life. From Egypt he went for a time to Constantinople, and finally came, about the year 415, to the neighbourhood of Marseilles, where he founded the celebrated monastery of St. Victor, into which he introduced the liturgy of the Alexandrine Church, with which he was most familiar. Amongst his pupils in the school of Lerins were St. Honoratus of Arles, St. Germanus of Auxerre, St. Lupus of Troyes, and most probably also our own St. Patrick. All these saints, who afterwards became great and influential bishops, carried away with them from Lerins not only the discipline, but also the rites and liturgy of that celebrated school.

In the year 429 the three latter saints came over to Wales in order to extirpate the Pelagian heresy, which was then infecting the British churches; for Pelagius himself was a Briton, and he had left some disciples in his native country, who were teaching his errors to the people. The name of one of them, a certain Gallicanus, is expressly mentioned by the Irish monk of Bobbio, who gives us the history of the Irish cursus.

It would seem, however, that Germanus resolved, in order to root out more thoroughly the poison of Pelagianism, to introduce the new Gallican liturgy into the British churches, and, in consequence of his eminent sanctity and great influence, he seems to have succeeded—at least to some considerable extent. Three years afterwards St. Patrick came

to preach in Ireland; and, of course, we may fairly assume that the liturgy which he and his associates introduced into Ireland was that with which they themselves were most familiar that is, the liturgy of Germanus, of Lerins, and of Alexandria.

It is stated, however, by the Irish monk of Bobbio, that this was also the liturgy of St. Jerome, of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of his brother St. Basil, of St. Anthony, St. Paul, St. Macarius, John, and other Fathers of the Egyptian deserts; and we know from independent sources that this statement is quite accurate. There is still in existence a Coptic, Greek, and Arabic liturgy bearing the name of St. Basil, which seems to have been largely used in the churches of the Alexandrine patriarchate, and the only copy of the Greek liturgy of St. Mark that has survived up to the present was found in a monastery of the Order of St. Basil at Rossano in Calabria.¹ There is also in existence a Greek, Coptic, and Arabic liturgy used in Egypt, which bears the name of St. Gregory Nazianzen; but it is practically the same as that of St. Basil. It is much more likely that St. Jerome would use the liturgy of St. James at Bethlehem and Jerusalem, where he spent the last thirty-four years of his life, than any liturgy of the Alexandrian patriarchate. We know, however, that he visited the churches of Alexandria, and the monasteries of Nitria, where in all probability he saw the Basilian liturgy in daily usage, if he did not make use of it himself.

The Irish monk then adds that this cursus was used by the aged Wandilochus and the blessed Comgall in their monastery (of Bangor), where they ruled over some three thousand monks. The same liturgy was carried to Luxeuil by Columbanus and his companions, whence it came to be widely diffused over Europe in all the Columban monasteries, as may be more fully seen in the lives of Columbanus, Eustasius, and Attala, abbot of Bobbio.

In truth, we do find in the life of the Abbot Eustasius that one of the charges brought against him and his monks before

¹ See *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, page 1021.

the Burgundian bishops, was that they unduly multiplied the prayers and collects of the mass,¹ which clearly points to some difference between their eucharistic liturgy and that of the Burgundian churches at this period. The same liturgy was, of course, in use at Bobbio during the lifetime of Columbanus and of his immediate disciples.

If we are to rely on this document, the Patrician liturgy in use throughout all Ireland during the fifth century was adopted in the monastery of Bangor without substantial change; from Bangor it passed over to the Columban houses on the continent of Europe; and it would doubtless be represented by the liturgy of the *Bobbio Missal* and the Antiphonary of Bangor. But this liturgy was by no means in general use throughout Ireland during the sixth and seventh centuries. Considerable diversity of usage had already grown up in Ireland about the middle of the sixth century, as we know from a very ancient authority.

According to the tract on the three Orders of Irish saints, attributed to Tirechan, the first Order had one and the same celebration of mass; but the saints of the second Order had different rites in the celebration of mass.² We are also told that they, or some of them, received "ritum celebrandi Missam"—a special rite—from the three saints of Britain—David, Gildas, and Docus, or Cadoc, as he is elsewhere called. St. Comgall, too, is expressly enumerated amongst the saints of this second Order; but the statement that they employed different rites in the celebration of mass would seem to imply that some of them, at least, did not accept the new ritual introduced from Britain; and Comgall, doubtless, was one of these. Otherwise it would be impossible to reconcile the statement of Tirechan with that of the monk of Bobbio. It seems highly probable that the Welsh liturgy was generally adopted in the south and south-east of Ireland, to which most of these saints of the second Order belonged, but that the Patrician rite still continued to be employed in the north of Ireland, where Welsh influence

¹ "Et ipse missarum solemnica multiplicatione orationum vel collectarum celebrabat" (*Vita Eustasii*; Migne, vol. lxxvii.)

"Unam celebrationem Missae"—"diversos ritus celebrandi."

was less felt. With regard to Comgall himself, I do not find that he or any of his preceptors were trained in the schools of Wales.

But how, it will be asked, did the Welsh rite, introduced into Ireland from David, Gildas, and Docus, differ from the old Patrician rite, and why was it so readily adopted by those conservative Irish saints of the second Order? This is a most interesting question, to which it is very difficult to find a satisfactory answer. Was the rite of the Welsh saints the old British liturgy that existed in Wales before St. Patrick came to Ireland, and which, as we have seen, was somewhat different from that introduced by our national apostle; or was it a later Gallican or Roman rite which they learned on the continent, and sought to introduce into Ireland as more conformable to the existing discipline of the continental Churches?

Unfortunately, we have no surviving fragment of the primitive British liturgy; it has completely disappeared.¹ St. Germanus, it would seem, tried to introduce his own Gallic liturgy; but we cannot say how far he succeeded. There is a story told in the Life of St. Brendan of Clonfert, which throws some light on this question. It is said that when Brendan was in Wales with Gildas, the latter had a missal written in Greek characters, which was placed on the altar on which Brendan was invited to offer the Holy Sacrifice. Brendan then besought the Lord to make those strange characters intelligible to him; and lo! he was able to read them like Gildas himself, just as well as if they were the Latin characters with which he was familiar from his boyhood. It is not improbable that this story had its origin in the fact that the rite practised in the monastery of Gildas was quite novel to Brendan, and it may be, too, that some of the words, like *Kyrie eleison*, &c., were written in the Greek character, with which he was heretofore entirely unacquainted.

In the life of St. David it is stated that he visited Jerusalem, that he was honourably received by the patriarch

¹ *Haddan and Stubbs*, vol. i., page 138.

of that city, from whom he received many gifts, and thence returned home to found his own great monastery in the wild valley of Rosina, swept bare by the breezes from the Irish sea. No one acquainted with the roving habits of the Welsh and Irish monks of those days will question the reality of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, on the ground that such a journey was difficult or dangerous.

In the life of Gildas we are told that he visited Rome and Ravenna, and doubtless learned much of the liturgy in use in these cities. The reference to Ravenna is significant, for at that time it was the second city of the western empire, and the real seat of its government; but these facts could hardly be known to a British monk in the tenth or eleventh century who merely drew on his imagination for those foreign pilgrimages. It is a singular fact that we also find that Cadoc visited both Greece and Jerusalem before returning home to found his own great monastery of Llancarvan.

Thus we find that the three Welsh saints, who were most intimately connected with the Ireland of the sixth century, and who gave a new mass to the saints of the second Order, were men who had travelled much in Palestine, Greece, and Italy, and doubtless had seen most of the liturgies in use in the celebrated churches of those countries, and which would certainly be very different from what they had seen both in Wales and Ireland during the years of their youth—for they were all intimately connected with Ireland, and all the three seem to have spent some years in Ireland.

At least these pilgrimages to foreign lands will account for the Latin missal written in Greek characters which Brendan saw in the monastery of Gildas, and which Gildas could read, but which it was considered to be quite miraculous that the Irish saint should be able to read.

In our opinion, however, the new ritual which these saints brought from the continent, and taught to their disciples of the second Order of Irish saints was neither of Welsh nor oriental origin, but the latest recension of the Roman liturgy, as revised by Pope Leo the Great, and afterwards by Pope Gelasius; whence it came to be called

the Gelasian liturgy; and we venture to think existing monuments strongly confirm this opinion.

The revision of the Roman liturgy by St. Leo the Great (440-461) is the earliest of which we have any certain and definite information. The *Sacramentary*, which bears his name, is generally admitted to be genuine, and there are several phrases in it which savour strongly of the severe and vigorous style of that great Pontiff. He is said in the *Liber Pontificalis* to have added the words *sanctum sacrificium immaculatam hostiam* to the canon of the mass, and several collects as well as many minor alterations in the liturgy are ascribed to his authorship.¹

The *Gelasian Sacramentary*, published some fifty years later by Pope Gelasius, whose reign (492-496) was all too brief, also introduced considerable changes into the eucharistic liturgy, the most noteworthy being the revision of the canon, which on that account still bears his name in many of the ancient missals.

It is obvious that these important changes could not easily have come to the knowledge of St. Patrick in our remote, and, from a Roman point of view, semi-barbarous island. It is almost certain that he died about the very time in which Gelasius became supreme Pontiff. So that neither the liturgy of St. Patrick nor of his contemporaries could be in conformity with the latest Roman emendations, during any part of the fifth century, nor probably during the first fifty years of the following century. But Welsh or Irish pilgrims going to Rome in the course of the sixth century would, doubtless, note these changes, and be anxious to bring their own liturgy at home more into conformity with the Roman usage. We have no doubt this is the true cause of the readiness with which the Irish saints of the second Order accepted a mass from the Welsh monastic Fathers, whose disciples they were. On the other hand, in those parts of the country where there was less foreign intercourse, or where they were more tenacious of their native customs, the old Patrician liturgy would still hold its ground; and this,

¹ See Migne, vol. lv., page 320.

doubtless, serves to explain the different rites used in celebrating Mass, which prevailed in Ireland under this second Order of saints.

A comparison of the *Stowe* and the *Bobbio Missal* will help to throw further light on this very interesting question. The *Stowe Missal*, as it appears at present, is, as we have seen, written in two different hands. The greater portion is written in a hand which competent authorities declare may well go back to the first half of the sixth, or even to the fifth century. If so, it may represent in those parts a liturgy older than the Gelasian recension, which could not have come into general use in Ireland before the middle of the sixth century; for the second Order of saints who introduced this new mass into their monastic churches flourished from A. D. 544 to 596; that is, during the latter half of the sixth century. This is strongly confirmed by the fact that the old canon of the *Missal* has been erased, and the Gelasian canon written in by the second hand, who flourished at a much later period. It also shows that these more recent changes in the *Missal* were made to bring it into conformity not with any oriental or Gallican rite, but with the later emendations of the Roman liturgy. The same conclusion is still further established by the fact that the *Bobbio Missal*, which was written during the last half of the seventh century, has, for what we now call the Ordinary of the Mass, the *Missa Romensis Cottidiana*, or daily Roman Mass; thus clearly showing that the disciples of Columbanus, whilst in many things adhering to the old Patrician cursus of Bangor, were quite ready to accept any revision of the liturgy that came clearly before them with the sanction of the Apostolic See.

Another important point to be noted is the prominence that is given in both these missals to the prayers for the Pope. In the *Stowe Missal* this prayer is given for the ordinary or daily mass in the following form:—

"Deus, qui Beato Petro, apostolo tuo, conlatis clavibus regni caelestis, animas ligandi autque solvendi pontificium tradidisti suscipe propitius preces nostras et intercessione ejus quesumus, Domine, auxilium, ut a peccatorum nostrorum nexibus liberemur. Per Dominum."

This prayer is written in the first or original hand in the *Stowe Missal*, and it is a curious fact that it is given in the same place and in the very same words in the *Bobbio Missal*, as printed by Muratori.¹

A careful examination and comparison of these two missals of our early Irish Church will also throw much light on many other questions that are highly interesting, both from a theological and antiquarian point of view. For the present, however, we must content ourselves in pointing out in a general way, from the evidence of these MSS., the intimate connection that existed between the Irish and the Roman Church during that very period during which certain writers would have us believe that the Irish Church lived in a state of isolated independence of the Apostolic See. Such theories can no longer be maintained with any show of probability, for the purely negative arguments by which it was sought to support them are found in the light of facts to be dissipated into thin air.

✠ J. HEALY.

THE IRISH ABBEY AT YPRES.—I.

THE following pages will be devoted to the history of the Irish Benedictine abbey of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady of Grace, in the Rue St. Jacques, at Ypres, or Yperen, a town on the Yperlée, in West Flanders, which town now contains but some sixteen thousand inhabitants, though in the fourteenth century it had, it is said, two hundred thousand—four thousand looms being constantly at work. It would be beside our purpose and beyond the scope of the present paper to trace the story of the rise and decline of Ypres; but it may not be thought out of place to say a few words about it. A castle was built here in the eighth century, which was destroyed by the Normans, at the end

¹ See Father Laverty's *Down and Connor*, vol. ii., App. iii.

of the ninth, and rebuilt by Baldwin the Bald, Earl of Flanders, at the beginning of the tenth century. Around this castle a town sprang up which acquired importance under Earls Theodoric of Alsace, and Guy of Dampierre, the latter of whom died in 1305. Philip the Fair, of France, took it in 1297. A century later, as was related in a previous number of the I. E. RECORD, it was unsuccessfully besieged by the revolted burghers of Ghent, assisted by a band of Englishmen. Not long after it was fortified by Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. It suffered terribly in the sixteenth century at the hand of the Gueux. In the seventeenth it was besieged and taken again and again; in 1648 it was captured by Condé; then in the following year it was retaken by the Archduke Leopold, to again fall into the hands of the French, this time under Turenne, in 1658, though it was shortly after restored by the Treaty of the Pyrenees. At the end of the following century it was twice besieged and taken by the French Republicans, as will be seen in the course of our story.

Among the objects of interest in Ypres may be mentioned the grand old church of St. Martin (originally served by a college of regular canons), which for a time was a cathedral; and the town-hall, the largest in Belgium, which adjoins the noble cloth-hall, whose portal is surmounted by the statue of our Lady of the Palissade, the patron of Ypres.¹ But to English-speaking people the little convent in the Rue St. Jacques is of primary importance. The abbey of our Lady of Grace enjoys the melancholy distinction of being the only Irish convent belonging to the great Benedictine Order, and of being one of the only two houses founded on the continent during the times of persecution for Irish religious women—the other being the convent of Irish Dominicanesses, which still flourishes at

¹ Some of these particulars have been taken from the *Guide to Belgium, Aix-la-Chapelle, and Cologne* (now, unfortunately, out of print), by Mr. W. H. James Weale, the distinguished archæologist, and editor of the *Analecta Liturgica*, whose services the country has been fortunate enough to secure as Keeper of the National Art Library, at South Kensington.

Belem, near Lisbon, in undiminished glory. To make the story of the Irish { abbey complete, it will be necessary to say something of the English Benedictine convents founded on the continent, as it was a filiation of one of them.

The first of these foundations was due to a lady who bore the illustrious name of Percy. It will be remembered that in 1569, the northern counties of England rose in insurrection under the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland for the purpose of freeing Mary Queen of Scots, then imprisoned at Tutbury, and the Duke of Norfolk, who had been committed to the Tower for aspiring to her hand. The rising was a new Pilgrimage of Grace; the banners which headed the insurgents were those of the Five Wounds and the Holy Cross; the re-establishment of Catholic worship was proclaimed; holy mass was once again said in the abbey of Ripon; and the Book of Common Prayer was publicly burnt. The rising proved abortive: and then the unhappy peasantry learned how terrible the vengeance of Elizabeth could be. Three hundred villages were given over to fire and sword, and orders were sent to the Earl of Sussex, the commander of the royal troops, to execute about one-fifth of the inhabitants of the towns.¹ The Earl of Westmoreland escaped to Flanders, but the Earl of Northumberland fell into the hands of the Regent Murray, who sold him to Cecil, the infamous minister of an infamous queen, for ten thousand crowns. On the octave day of the Assumption, 1572, Northumberland was executed at York without a trial; and he died declaring that England was in schism, and that he firmly believed in the Papal Supremacy. He had married the Lady Anne Somerset, daughter of the second Earl of Worcester, who after his execution retired to Brussels, from which place she was expelled, with other English Catholics, in 1576, at the request of Cecil. The Countess died in 1591, leaving among other children the Lady Mary Percy, who was the first to project the erection of a religious house for English women on the continent.

¹ See Miss Drane's *History of England*, page 397.

Seven years after the death of her mother, in 1598, that is, Lady Mary obtained permission from the "Archdukes" Albert and Isabel to found a house for English nuns in Brussels, the capital of Brabant, from whose ancient dukes she was descended.¹ She acquired a house from Rowland Longinus, Viscount of Bergues, and determined that her foundation should be for Benedictines; and through the influence of the Archduke Albert, she obtained permission for some English nuns of that order to be transferred from the abbey of St. Peter in Rheims.

It is certainly not the least of the glories of the Brussel's house, and through it of the Irish abbey of Ypres, that its first religious should have been drawn from the ancient abbey of St. Peter, at Rheims—illustrious not less for the strictness of its observance² than for its age. The fiftieth

¹ About the year 1150, Agnes, heiress of Percy, married Joceline, second son of Godfrey the Bearded, Duke of Brabant, by his first wife Ida of Namur. Joceline succeeded to the honours of the house of Percy, and his descendants, in an unbroken male line, enjoyed them till the end of the seventeenth century, when they devolved in an heiress, the Lady Elizabeth Percy, who married (for her third husband) the Duke of Somerset. Their grand-daughter, Lady Elizabeth Seymour, in default of male issue, succeeded to the barony of Percy, and married Sir Hugh Smithson, a Yorkshire squire, who was created Duke of Northumberland. The barony of Percy passed to the Duke of Athole, on the death of Algernon, fourth Duke of Northumberland, in 1865. After the death of Ida of Namur, Duke Godfrey of Brabant, married Clementia of Burgundy, and had a daughter, Adela of Louvain, who married Henry I. of England.

² One of the first communities of Benedictine nuns to return to a strict observance of their rule in the sixteenth century was that of Montmartre, near Paris, in the church of which St. Ignatius and his first companions made their religious profession. The fame of the edifying life of the Montmartre nuns led Jacqueline de Grand-Pré, when elected Abbess of Rheims, to determine that the same observance should be followed at St. Peter's. With the consent of the Archbishop, Cardinal Robert de Lenoncourt, she visited Montmartre and stayed there eighteen months; she then went to St. Maur's, at Verdun, and afterwards to Chelles (whose abbesses in the next century were generous benefactors of the English monks of their order). She returned to St. Peter's, after an absence of four years, and instituted among her nuns the same observance that had made their sisters at Paris so illustrious. Abbess Jacqueline died in 1532. Her good work lived on and continued to flourish in spite of severe trials which the convent had to endure from the malice of heretics, false sisters, and the licence of enemies. So great were these sufferings that the constancy of the nuns is said by Benedictine annalists to have made them equal to martyrs; while their example stirred many other religious houses to emulation and imitation.

abbess of this convent was Renée of Lorraine, daughter of Claude, Duke of Guise and sister of the celebrated Cardinal of Lorraine, who took a leading part in the Council of Trent. To the care of Abbess Renée, Mary Queen of Scots, her niece,¹ entrusted one of her Scottish favourites, Margaret Kircaldy by name. Margaret was born in 1562, and probably professed in 1581, in which year, on the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, a young Englishwoman, Jane, daughter of Sir John Berkeley, of Beveston Castle, Gloucestershire, received the habit of a Benedictine nun at St. Peter's. Sister Margaret soon gained the confidence of her superiors, and became the right hand of Abbess Renée and her successor and namesake.² At the time of the establishment of the English house Dame Margaret was abbess-coadjutor and must of necessity have had much to do with the arrangements. But we must not dwell longer on the history of St. Peter's and its abbesses.³

Among the English nuns sent to Brussels was Dame

¹ René II., Duke of Lorraine, had, by his wife, Philippa of Gueldres, among other children, Anthony, who succeeded him as Duke, and Claud, to whom he left his French fiefs of Guise Aumale, &c. The latter was made Duke of Guise by the King of France, and was the founder of the family of that name, which, after playing an important part in French politics, died out in the seventeenth century. Duke Claud had a numerous family, which included Francis, his successor, two Cardinals, the Abbess Renée, and Mary, who married James I. of Scotland, by whom she became the mother of Mary Queen of Scots.

² Abbess Renée died in 1602, after having ruled the abbey for sixty years. She was succeeded by her great niece Renée, daughter of Henry Duke of Guise, known as *Le Balafre*, and Catherine of Cleves, who was blessed by Philip de Bec, Archbishop of Rheims, on April 12th, 1602, nine days after the death of her predecessor, she being then seventeen years of age. She died in 1726, and, according to the necrology of the house, was buried *in the tomb of the Queen of Scotland*.

³ Dame Margaret was elected Abbess in 1626, that she might rule the abbey till Frances of Lorraine, daughter of Charles Duke of Guise, and Catherine de Joyeuse, then a child of five, should be old enough to assume the reins of government. Abbess Kircaldy was blessed by the English Benedictine Archbishop Gifford. She died in 1639, and is thus spoken of in the necrology :—"On February 3rd, 1649, died Margaret Kircaldy, our abbess, by birth a Scot, educated from her tenderest years in this monastery, which she has made illustrious by her eminent piety. She lived fifty-one years after her profession, and was abbess twelve years, and died, to our great grief, on the 3rd of February, 1639." We have reason for believing that a longer account of the life and virtues of this Scottish nun is in course of preparation.

Jane Berkeley, who has already been mentioned as having taken the habit in 1581; and with them went Dame Noëlle, the prioress. The foundation of the new house, which was dedicated in honour of the Glorious Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, was approved by his Holiness, Clement VIII., who placed the community under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Mechlin, the diocesan. Lady Mary Percy entered the new house as a subject, and made her solemn profession in 1599. So many others joined the community that in 1600 the archbishop, Matthias Van den Hove (better known, perhaps, as Hovius), ordered that an abbess should be elected. The choice fell on Dame Jane Berkeley, who received the abbatial blessing on November 14th, 1599. She died in 1616, and was succeeded by Lady Mary Percy. In 1623, in consequence of the increase of numbers a new house was founded at Cambrai from Brussels, and in the following year another was established at Ghent.

The first nuns of the Ghent house were Dames Lucy Knatchbull, Eugenia Poulton, Magdalen Digby, and Mary Roper; and with them were two novices. Dame Lucy Knatchbull was elected abbess, and received the abbatial blessing on the feast of St. Benedict, 1624. Before the end of the year she had twenty-two subjects. From Ghent filiations were made at Pontoise, Boulogne, in the foundation of which St. Vincent of Paul took a great part; at Dunkirk, where a house was established by Dame Mary Knatchbull, niece of Abbess Lucy, in 1662, with the consent of the English Government, and at Ypres. We are more especially concerned with the abbey of Ypres; but before relating the history of that foundation it will not be out of place to notice that King James II. of England was converted at Ghent, and intended, after his succession, to establish the English Benedictine nuns of that city as the first monastery in his kingdom. King James was unable to realize his wish; but the nuns of Ghent were driven to England by the French Revolution. They settled, in 1795, at Preston, whence they moved, in 1811, to Caverswall Castle, near Stone, in Staffordshire, and from that place, in 1854, to

Oulton, where they are still established. The Brussels community was also driven to England in 1794, and settled at Winchester, where it was received by the illustrious Bishop Milner—not yet bishop, however, but priest of the mission. The nuns removed to East Bergholt, in Suffolk, in 1857, where they flourish and devote themselves, above all things, to the exact performance of the *opus divinum*. The nuns of Dunkirk were made prisoners by the Revolutionists, and confined for eighteen months in the convent of the Poor Clares at Gravelines. In 1795 they returned to England, by permission of the Government, and settled at Hammersmith, whence they removed, in 1863, to Teignmouth, in Devonshire.¹

There had been Benedictine monks in Ypres for many years before the period at which we have now arrived—monks who had left the abbey of Therouaune (in which their order had been established by King Theodoric in expiation of the murder of St. Leger), when that place was taken by the troops of the Emperor Charles V. But there were no nuns of the Order. In 1665, however, Abbess Knatchbull, of Ghent, was asked to send some of her religious, to found a house in that town, by the bishop, Monsignor Martin de Praets, who, before his election to Ypres, had been a canon of the cathedral church of St. Bavon at Ghent, and was well acquainted with the resplendent merits of the English nuns. Abbess Knatchbull acceded to his request, and on May 22nd, 1665, the new community reach Ypres. It consisted of Dames Mary Beaumont, Flavia Cary, Helen Wait, Vincentia Eyre, Aloysia Gorman, Aldegonde Finch, Mary Lucy; a choir novice, Sister Mary Anne Jenison; and a lay Sister, Martha Lowe. Dames Mary Lucy, and Aloysia Gorman afterwards returned to Ghent. A curious story is told of the latter in a document found in the British Museum, by Dom Aidan Gasquet, O.S.B., among the papers of Cardinal Antonio Gualterio, for many years Protector of the English nation in

¹ Most of these details are taken from a small handbook to *The Religious Houses of the United Kingdom*, published by Burns & Oates of London.

Rome, and first Cardinal Secretary of Propaganda. It is a remarkable account of an apparition of a soul in purgatory, and the paper is signed by Dame Mary Roper, sister of Lord Teynham, of Linsted Lodge, Kent; Dame Magdalen Digbye; Dame Catherine Wigmore, daughter of William Wigmore of Lutton, Herefordshire, and first abbess of the convent at Boulogne; and Dame Mary Knatchbull, daughter of Reginald Knatchbull of —, Kent, and sister of Dame Lucy, first abbess of Ghent.¹

Four years after the arrival of the nuns in Ypres, the bishop gave them permission to elect an abbess. Their choice fell on Dame Mary Beaumont, who was blessed in the cathedral. On May 3rd, of that same year, 1669, Dame Susanna Carew made her profession, being the first who had done so since the establishment of the house; she died twelve years later.

In spite of all efforts to the contrary, the abbey of Ypres did not flourish, and at length Abbess Beaumont asked the prioress of the English Benedictine nuns, established in Paris,² to send some of her subjects to Ypres. She transferred the house to them conditionally. Abbess Knatchbull of Ghent, however, asked Abbess Caryl of Dunkirk to go to Ypres, in order to keep the house for the congregation, and to take with her a sufficient number of subjects to elect an abbess for a community of Irish, as she had always intended that the abbey of Ypres should eventually be set aside for nuns of that nation. Abbess Beaumont died in 1682, and then Abbess Caryl went to Ypres with four of her nuns, two of them being Irish.

Dame Flavia Cary was elected abbess on November 19th, 1682, and subjects were soon found for her by Abbess

¹The whole story will be found in the *Downside Review* for March, 1890.

²A filiation made in 1652, from the house established in Cambria by the monks of the English Benedictine Congregation. They were driven from Paris in 1795, and then settled successively at Marnhull, in Dorsetshire; Cannington, in Somersetshire (1807); and Colwich, in Staffordshire (1835).

Knatchbull, who requested the superiors of the various houses connected with Ghent to send their Irish religious to Ypres. Among those sent in answer to this request were Dame Mary Joseph Butler, from Pontoise, and Dame Joseph O'Bryen, from Dunkirk; whilst Abbess Knatchbull herself sent Dame Ursula Butler. The house was then formally made over to the Irish nation; and from this time forward the abbey of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady of Grace at Ypres has been an Irish convent. The story of the house during the two centuries which have since elapsed must be left till next month, and for the present we must content ourselves with saying that it is not devoid of romantic interest.

E. W. BECK.

IRISH PARLIAMENTS.

ON the memorable Thursday, 8th of April, 1886, when the Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone introduced an Irish Home Rule Bill into the English House of Commons, during the delivery of a speech replete with statesmanlike thought, profound and far-reaching, while unanswerable in array of facts and reasoning, he very justly asserted, that "for the six last centuries—for five at least—Ireland has had a parliament separate from ours;" and then he put the query, "Did separation of the parliaments destroy the unity of the Empire?" It seems indeed strange that such a contention should be questioned. However, the representative for Dublin University, the Hon. David Plunkett, undertook to refute Mr. Gladstone's declaration in these vague and unguarded words:—"He"—alluding to the Prime Minister—"spoke of the old parliaments of Ireland, and said they had existed for five hundred years, while England was growing in greatness and glory. That is an entire mis-

take.”¹ The former Solicitor-General for Ireland must not alone have been little conversant with his country’s history, but even with the published statutes of this Kingdom, and of its ancient laws, which still have a binding force, while not yet repealed by the Act of Union, nor since annulled in the Imperial Parliament, when he ventured to make such a statement. Still more singular was the inability of other Irish members of Parliament subsequently to correct his errors, although that remarkable debate was adjourned for several succeeding nights, and some books on Irish history must have had a place in the Library of the House of Commons. It may, therefore, be excusable, briefly to treat a subject, which ought to be one of great interest to Irishmen, especially at the present time.

The annexed historic facts and dates, regarding the assembling of Irish parliaments, are too succinct for a complete enumeration and understanding of their sessions, their constitutional bearings and legal enactments; but, in this compendious form, those notices here inserted may serve to furnish the politician and student with a ready reference to other sources for more detailed information. They are only intended to supply briefly and imperfectly some omissions or illustrations of chronological details, and as memoranda for more fully comprehending or determining the scope of historic data, which may easily be enlarged. To future investigators must be assigned the task of completing or enumerating the lists and records of our Irish parliaments²—a topic which has not been hitherto exhaustively or even adequately treated.³

¹ See Hansard’s *Parliamentary Debates*, third series, commencing with the Accession of William IV., vol. ccciv., April 8th, 1886, col. 1138.

² A list of the Irish Acts of Parliaments yet remaining on record, but unprinted, has been furnished by James Hardiman, Esq., in his supplement to the *Eighth Report of the Commissioners on the Public Records of Ireland*, vol. ii., pp. 353-383. Published at London, 1820, fol.

³ The Irish statute rolls contain 1263 statutes never yet published, according to William Lynch, treating on the prescriptive baronies of Ireland. His most learned and researchful work is intitled, *A View of the Legal Institutions, Honorary Hereditary Offices, and Feudal Baronies established in Ireland during the Reign of Henry the Second*. London, 1830, 8vo. This book is the very best and most authentic statement on the present subject as yet published; and it has been deduced most carefully from court rolls, inquisitions, and other original records.

The origin of these representative assemblies must be referred immediately to England, and the institution itself has been traced to the Anglo-Saxon times, when great councils or conventions were summoned by the monarch.¹ However, these were mainly oligarchical in form, the influences of deliberation and of action being confined to the higher nobles and clergy.² After the Anglo-Norman invasion of William the Conqueror, the French term *parlement*, referring to a convocation of the highest courts or notables of the kingdom, came into use;³ but, regarding its general and relative jurisdiction, powers, development and representation, divers opinions have been entertained.⁴ It seems very certain, however, that the Anglo-Saxons derived few advantages from the Conqueror's rule.⁵ This English form of government was unknown or not adopted in Ireland, until the close of the twelfth century; and, even then, it had little bearing on the social and political condition of the native Irish, who for the more ancient *feis* or convention of states had then substituted the clan system of rule, which

¹ The Witen-Gemot, or Supreme Council of the Nation, consisted of the king, archbishops, bishops, dukes, earls, thanes, abbots, priests, and deacons. In this assembly, laws, secular and ecclesiastical, were promulgated and repealed, while these royal charters and grants were confirmed and ratified. For further information, the reader is referred to *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*; ably edited by Benjamin Thorpe. London, 1840, large folio.

² These matters have been most ably treated by John Mitchell Kemble, in his well-known work, *The Saxons in England, a History of the English Commonwealth till the Period of the Norman Conquest*. In two volumes. London, 1849, 8vo.

³ The original version of the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*, was probably written some time between the years 1294 and 1327, and several manuscript copies of it are yet preserved, but variously interpolated. The investigation of this subject has been taken in hands by that learned archivist, Thomas Duffus Hardy, who has most carefully edited and published the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*; an *Ancient Treatise on the Mode of Holding Parliament in England*. London, 1846, 8vo. To this a preface and learned notes, with various readings, are affixed.

⁴ On the 1st of August, 1086, William I., assembled at Salisbury the archbishops, bishops, abbots, knights, barons, and viscounts, with their military vassals. See *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*; edited by William Stubbs, M.A., vol. i., Pars Prior, page 139. London, 1868, 8vo.

⁵ For particulars the reader is referred to, that admirable *History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results*, by Edward A. Freeman, M.A., In 6 vols. Oxford, 1867-1879, 8vo.

may best be learned from a study of the Brehon laws. These have been partially published, and they are still in process of publication. Even the rolls, still preserved in Ireland¹ or in England,² do not at all furnish us with a complete record of parliaments, which were held in various places, with well-recognised powers for deliberating and for legislation. Several of those assemblies have been noticed in our annals, but without sufficient details regarding their proceedings or enactments.

After the Anglo-Norman Invasion, in 1172, when King Henry II.³ arrived in our country, and had subjugated certain parts of the island, he was only styled Lord of Ireland; for his power and jurisdiction extended not beyond the limited Anglo-Irish conquest and the colonies, which he had been enabled to establish only in a few cities and districts. To this kingdom the laws of England were extended and confirmed, in a council, held at Lismore, while these were gratefully received by his subjects.⁴ Moreover, the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum Hiberniæ*,⁵ as a separate and distinct kingdom from England, and as a direction for

¹ The *Liber Munerum Publicorum Hiberniæ, ab An. 1152 usque ad 1827; or the Establishments of Ireland from the Nineteenth of King Stephen to the Seventh of George IV.*, during a period of Six Hundred and Seventy-five Years being the Report of Rowley Lascelles, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. This fine folio publication, in two volumes and in seven parts, appeared in 1852. It was commenced under the authority of the Record Commissioners of Ireland, and it affords most valuable information concerning the parliamentary and official history of Ireland.

² An excellent general idea of English historical documents, published and unpublished, may be derived from a perusal of F. S. Thomas's *Hand-book to the Public Records*. London, 1853, royal 8vo.

³ He reigned from the 19th December, 1154, to the 6th of July, 1189.

⁴ See *Matthæi Parisiensis Monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*, vol. ii., page 285. Edition of Henry Richards Luard, M.A., London, 1874, 8vo.

⁵ The title of this document reads: *Henricus Rex Angliæ Conquestor, et Dominus Hiberniæ, &c.* It begins: *Dominus Hiberniæ, &c., Mittit hanc formam Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus, Prioribus, Comitibus, Baronibus, Justiciariis, Vicecomitibus, Majoribus, Præpositis, Ministris et omnibus Fidelibus suis Terræ Hiberniæ Tenendi Parliamentum.* It then proceeds: *In primis Summonitio Parliamenti præcedere debet per Quadraginta Dies.* More about this document may be found in our subsequent pages, and its exact period of promulgation has been referred to the sixth year of King Henry IV.'s reign.

holding parliaments there,¹ agrees for the most part with that said to have been allowed by William the Conqueror for England.² Where it is altered, the change only fits it the better for the kingdom of Ireland.³

However, King Henry constituted the kingdom of Ireland as absolutely separate and distinct from England, by granting it to his son, John.⁴ When the latter arrived in Ireland, his lawyers and counsellors framed a charter and code of laws,⁵ at the request of his Irish lieges, and those were deposited for their direction in the Exchequer Court at Dublin.⁶ When John became king of England, the separate kingdom of Ireland was then united with it under the one crown. In the twelfth year of his reign a parliament was held in Ireland, then governed by chief justiciaries or vice-roys.⁷ It is somewhat remarkable, also, that Henry de Londres, Archbishop of Dublin, was present, and allowed

¹ Sir Edward Coke states, in his *Institutes of the Laws of England*, that he saw such a document. Book iv., chap. i., page 12, and chap. lxxvi., page 349.

² The reader is referred to Harris' Ware, vol. ii., *The Antiquities of Ireland*, for an English translation of the Modus or Form for holding Parliaments and Councils in Ireland, as also for a learned disquisition on the Common and Statute Laws introduced by the English into Ireland, and on the settlement of the Legislature there. See chap. xiii., pp. 78-88. Dublin, 1745, fol.

³ See William Molyneux's *Case of Ireland's being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, pp. 29, 30. Dublin : Original Edition, 1698, 12mo.

⁴ He reigned as king over England from the 27th of May, 1199, to the 19th of October, 1216.

⁵ Several of Earl John's charters refer to the grants of lands, franchises, and liberties in Ireland, during the lifetime of his father, as also during the reign of his brother, Richard I., over England, as if he held the island in fee, and in absolute and uncontrolled dominion. See Francis Plowden's *History of Ireland from its Invasion under Henry II. to its Union with Great Britain*, vol. ii., book i., chap. ii., page 171. London, 1812, 8vo.

⁶ According to the rolls of Henry III., 30 Rot.

⁷ From the close of the twelfth century, the governor of the Anglo-Norman colony in Ireland was usually styled "Capitalis Justiciarius," which was a title applied in England and Normandy to the highest officer in the king's court, and charged with the whole civil and military administration during the monarch's absence. Hostages were then demanded from the Anglo-Irish viceroys and chief barons as guarantees for their fidelity. See John T. Gilbert's *History of the Viceroys of Ireland, with Notices of the Castle of Dublin and its Chief Occupants in Former Times*, chap. ii., pp. 64, 65, Dublin, 1865, 8vo.

place immediately after the Archbishop of Canterbury, when King John signed *Magna Charta*, in the congress at Runnymede.

It has been asserted that popular representation in a parliament was first introduced¹ during the reign of King Henry III. into England.² Before the year 1244, the term *Parliamentum* was never applied to a legislative assembly in England by any contemporary writer, or used in any record.³ There are authorities for stating that at least two parliaments were summoned in Ireland: one in the thirty-eighth year of Henry III.'s reign, A.D. 1253,⁴ and the other in the fifty-third, A.D. 1269.⁵ The very first year of this monarch's reign, and at the request of the Irish barons, the Earl of Pembroke, protector of the kingdom during the king's minority, granted substantially a duplicate of *Magna Charta*,⁶ wherein their rights, privileges, and immunities were placed on the very same foundation with those of the English, while all the civil and political institutions of England were equally secured to Ireland, as a free and as an independent nation.⁷ Moreover, several minute and important differences are introduced to accommodate in forms the English charter to the usages and proceedings of the Anglo-Irish settlers.⁸

¹ For a very painstaking and impartial investigation on the subject of parliaments in England, the reader is referred to the Rev. Dr. John Lingard's *History of England*, vol. iii., chap. ii., Henry III., pp. 160-174. London, edition of 1837-1839, crown 8vo.

² He reigned from the 28th of October, 1216, to the 16th of November, 1272.

³ See Thomas Duffus Hardy's *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum; an Ancient Treatise on the Mode of Holding the Parliament in England*. Preface, page xiv.

⁴ According to Thomas Rymer's *Fœdera Conventiones, Litteræ, et cujuscunque Generis Acta publica, inter Reges Angliæ et alios quosvis Imperatores, Reges, Pontifices, Principes vel Communitates; ab ineunte sæculo duodecimo, viz., ab Anno 1101 ad nostra usque Tempora habita aut tractata*, &c. This valuable collection appeared in seventeen folio volumes. London, 1704-1715. A supplement by Sanderson, vols. xviii.-xx. London, 1726-1735.

⁵ One of its statutes is now among the rolls, which was formerly preserved in Birmingham Tower, Castle of Dublin.

⁶ The original of this charter is still preserved in Dublin among our Irish archives.

⁷ King Henry III. also proclaimed, that all the laws and customs of England might be possessed by the kingdom of Ireland.

⁸ See Lynch's *View of the Legal Institutions, Honorary Hereditary Offices, and Feudal Baronies established in Ireland during the Reign of Henry the Second*, chap. ii., pp. 20, 21.

During the reign of King Edward I.,¹ and in the year 1295, besides issuing writs to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, the sheriff of each county and liberty was directed to return two knights representatives in parliament.² This assembly was inconsiderable in point of numbers, since several declined to attend.³ Yet, the public grievances seem to have been maturely weighed, and ordinances were enacted to provide for the public weal. During his reign, the native chiefs petitioned the king, that he would grant the free enjoyment of English laws to the whole body of Irishmen indiscriminately. This he desired to do; but the baneful ascendancy of the Anglo-Norman rulers there was too powerfully exercised, in opposition to his will.⁴ And so inveterate has been the official despotism ever since, that it dominates at the present day, and must continue to usurp the power of a supreme government over that of Great Britain until abolished or regulated by a radical change in the whole system. Thus the faction of ascendancy, that now opposes a constitutional parliament and a Home Rule government for Ireland, is practically independent of, while it actually controls, the Imperial Parliament and Government, as also their constitution and laws, through the agency of a clique, called the Privy Council, determining all public judicial proceedings, and meeting in Dublin Castle.

A parliament was held in Ireland,⁵ in the third year of King Edward II.⁶ Some useful legislation was attempted during his reign, for the better government of Ireland, and to prevent corruptions or abuses there against his own or his subjects' injury and oppression.

¹ He reigned from the 20th of November, A.D. 1272, to the 7th of July, 1307.

² According to the *Liber Niger Ecclesie S. Trinitatis*, Dublin.

³ See Rev. Dr. Leland's *History of Ireland, from the Invasion of Henry II.*, vol. i., page 253.

⁴ See Thomas Moore's *History of Ireland*, vol. iii., chap. xxxv., pp. 30-37.

⁵ The enactments of this parliament were the first printed by Sir Richard Bolton, Chief Baron, in his edition of *The Irish Statutes*, published A.D. 1621.

⁶ He reigned from the 8th of July, 1307, to the 20th of January, 1327.

During the reign of King Edward III.,¹ at least ten parliaments were called in Ireland. One of these was held about the seventeenth year of his reign. In the twenty-ninth year, he ordained, that errors of judgment given in his Irish courts should be reformed, not by the parliament of England only, as hitherto, but by that of Ireland. This decree was intended to give independent consequence to the island.

However, the famous parliament held at Kilkenny,² by Lionel, Duke of Clarence, in the fortieth year of the reign of King Edward III. was celebrated for the coercive character of its proscriptions against the native Irish. Like all such legislation, it proved deeply injurious to the interests of the Anglo-Irish residents; nor did it at all affect the existing social condition or fortunes of the native septs. In the fiftieth year of his reign, a singular power was exercised by the commonalty of the several counties, cities, and boroughs, when they elected certain persons as commissioners to treat about Irish affairs with the king's council. The reasonable expenses of their journey to England, of their stay there, and of a return thence to their homes, were also decreed by the king's writ.

Richard II. reigned twenty-two years,³ and held two parliaments in his own person. But he had the imprudence, in an arbitrary and unconstitutional manner, to entrust Ireland and its islands, with absolute and entire regal dominion during his own life, to a favourite, Robert de Vere, Earl of Oxford. He was created Duke of Ireland, with power to pass all writs under his own test, to place and displace all its officers, as also to name his own ministers and deputies. He was invested with all royalties, that had been enjoyed by

¹ He began to reign the 24th January, 1327, and on the 21st of June, 1377, he died.

² The statute of Kilkenny was first printed from a manuscript in the Library of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lambeth; the Norman French having been translated, and, with notes, most ably edited by the accomplished antiquary, James Hardiman, Esq., M.R.I.A. Published in Dublin, for the Irish Archæological Society, 1843, 4to.

³ From the 22nd of June, 1377, to the 29th of September, 1399.

the king's predecessors.¹ At least five or six parliaments were summoned in the time of Richard II.

King Henry IV. reigned fourteen years,² and summoned four Irish parliaments. One of these deputed the Archbishop of Armagh and of Dublin to lay before the king several national grievances, and the envoys were graciously received; but, being constantly engaged in domestic troubles and insurrections, this king could not introduce any beneficial measures for reform. One of those parliaments was held by Thomas of Lancaster, Duke of Clarence, who had been appointed to the government of Ireland for twenty-one years; while another, assembled in the fifth year of King Henry IV.'s reign, under the Earl of Ormond, chief justice, affirmed the charter of Ireland, and with it the statutes of Kilkenny. In the sixth year of his reign, the Irish *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum* was exemplified under the Great Seal of Ireland,³ and it differs little from the English *Modus*.⁴ But a parliament of greatest importance was held in the tenth year of that monarch's rule, when in Ireland it was enacted, "That the statutes made in England should not be of force in this Kingdom, unless they were allowed and published in this Kingdom by parliament."⁵

During the reign of King Henry V., and which lasted for nine years,⁶ two parliaments sat in Ireland. The Earl of Ormond had been created Lord Lieutenant, and he was invested with extraordinary powers; viz., to summon councils; to hold, adjourn, prorogue, or dissolve parliaments; to pardon traitors, murderers, and felons; as also to remove or appoint all officers of state, except the chancellor and treasurer.⁷

¹ Sir Edward Coke justly remarks on this transfer of Ireland, that the king's "letters patent could not grant so royal a member of his imperial style to any, no more than he could do his kingdom of England." *Institutes of the Laws of England*, Book iv., page 357.

² From the 30th September, 1399, to the 20th of March, 1413.

³ It was first printed, in 1622, by Anthony Dopping, the Protestant Bishop of Meath. A new edition of it was printed in 1712.

⁴ See Thomas Duffus Hardy's *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*; an *Ancient Treatise on the Mode of Holding the Parliament in England*. Preface, page vi., and n. 13, pages xxiv.-xxvi.

⁵ See William Molyneux's *Case of Ireland's being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, page 64.

⁶ From the 21st of March, 1413, to the 31st of August, 1422.

⁷ See Francis Plowden's *History of Ireland*, vol. i., book i., chap. x., page 239.

During the reign of King Henry VI.,¹ there was a parliament held in Ireland nearly every year.² Two or even three parliaments were summoned during some years. The intestine wars between the Houses of Lancaster and of York communicated their influences to Ireland. The Duke of York—an aspirant to the throne—was appointed Lord Lieutenant for ten years, with extraordinary powers, which were largely used to favour his own interests. When betrayed and defeated at Blore Heath, he fled to Ireland, and summoned a parliament, which confirmed the patent constituting him lieutenant of this kingdom, although he was denounced and proclaimed a traitor in England. That parliament also decreed, that if any person should imagine, compass, or excite his destruction or death, and for this purpose confederate with the Irish or other persons, he should be attainted of high treason. It was enacted, moreover, that Ireland was and always had been incorporated within itself by ancient laws and customs, and that it was only to be governed by such laws as had been advised, accepted, affirmed and proclaimed by the Lords and Commons of the land in parliament assembled. It was likewise declared, that there had even been a royal seal peculiar to Ireland by custom, privilege and franchise, to which alone the subjects were to yield obedience; that this realm had its constable and marshal, before whom all appeals were finally determinable; yet, since orders had been of late issued under another seal, and the subjects summoned into England to

¹ It lasted from the 1st of September, 1422, while he was an infant, to the 4th of March, 1461, when he was deposed by King Edward IV. However, King Henry VI. resumed possession once more, on the 9th October, 1470. Again, the battle of Barnet, fought on Easter day, the 14th of April, 1471, drove Henry VI. from the throne. After Edward IV. recovered the Royal authority, the years of his reign continued to be reckoned from the 4th of March, 1461, as if no interruption had occurred.

² The oldest statute enacted in Ireland, and preserved in the Rolls' Office, is one referred to the 5th year of King Henry VI. See *Report on the Parliamentary Rolls of Ireland*, page 354, in *The Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Reports from the Commissioners appointed by his Majesty to execute the Measures recommended in an Address of the House of Commons, respecting the Public Records of Ireland*. With Supplement and Appendixes, 1816-1820, vol. ii. Supplement to Eighth Report, A.D. 1819, 6. Rolls' Office, by James Hardiman, Sub-Commissioner.

prosecute their suits before a foreign jurisdiction, to the great grievance of the people, and in violation of the rights and franchises of the land, it was enacted, that for the future, no persons should be obliged by any commandment under any other seal but that of Ireland to answer any appeal or any other matter out of the said land; and it was also decreed, that no officer to whom such commandment might come, should put the same into execution, under the penalty of forfeiture of goods and chattels and 1,000 marks, half payable to the king, and the other to the prosecutor; furthermore, that all appeals for treason in Ireland should be determinable before the constable and marshal in Ireland, and in no other place. Finally, if any person appealed to any other person within the land of Ireland, and if the matter were found to be false, the prosecutor should suffer death, while no pardon in the case could avail him.¹

In the thirty-fourth year of the reign of this king it was enacted that only one parliament should be summoned in the same year. This law was passed to remedy the frequent imposition of subsidies, which were demanded in the distracted state of affairs both in England and in Ireland.

One of the most profound and distinguished among modern historical English writers has pronounced, that so far as precedents and authorities extend in early times, those countenance an opinion that English statutes were valid in Ireland. From the time of Henry VI. or Edward IV. it is certainly established, that they had no operation, unless enacted by the Irish Parliament.²

During the reign of King Edward IV.³ two years were not allowed to pass over without a meeting of Parliament.⁴ One of his own convening was held at Wexford, by the

¹ See John T. Gilbert's *History of the Viceroys of Ireland*, chap. ix., pp. 369, 370.

² See Henry Hallam's *Constitutional History of England from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George IV.*, vol. ii., chap. xviii., page 767. London, 1827, 4to.

³ This monarch died at Westminster, on the 9th of April, A.D. 1483.

⁴ There is an abridgment of the statutes 11 Hen. IV. to 11 Ed. IV. preserved among the manuscripts of Trinity College, Dublin, and classed E. i. 43. It seems to have been formerly in possession of Archbishop Ussher, as also to have been noted and used by him.

Earl of Desmond, who was Lord Deputy of Ireland, in 1463. From its record we learn, that it was customary to pay the knights for their attendance as representatives, in various parts of the kingdom.¹ Also, Thomas, the seventh Earl of Kildare, while Lord Deputy, held two parliaments at Drogheda. At one of these, the English statutes against rapes, and all other statutes theretofore made in England, were extended to Ireland. During this period, great divisions existed between the rival factions of Kildare and Ormond; while rival parliaments or conventions were summoned at the same time, in which contrariant laws were enacted. In 1472, a parliament was held at Naas,² in the twelfth year of Edward IV.'s reign, to provide for the better defence of the English territory.³ In that there summoned, an Act was passed in defiance of King Edward IV., and this authorized "the Lord Justice Gerol, Earl of Kildare, to adjourn and prorogue parliament at pleasure, while he was necessarily employed against the insurgents."⁴ Soon afterwards he held a parliament in Dublin.⁵ Meantime, while dissensions prevailed among the English of the Pale, which was then greatly circumscribed, the native chiefs and people were free to follow their own courses and modes of living.

In less than two years, two parliaments were held in Ireland during the reign of Richard III.⁶ One of these assembled in Dublin, and some accounts of its proceedings exist.⁷ We find it recorded that, in 1484, Gerald, eighth Earl of Kildare, as Lord Deputy, received from parliament a subsidy of 13s. 4d. to be levied out of every ploughland under

¹ According to the original roll. See also *State Papers*, vol. ii., part iii., page 496.

² See *The Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, page 41.

³ See Thomas Moore's *History of Ireland*, vol. iii., chap. xlii., page 190.

⁴ See this very curious document alluded to, in the *Liber Munerum Publicorum Hiberniæ*, part vi., page 3., col. 2.

⁵ See *The Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, page 44.

⁶ It is ascertained from the memoranda rolls of the Exchequer in Ireland, that he commenced to reign from the 26th of June, 1483. He was killed in the battle of Bosworth, on the 22nd of August, 1485.

⁷ See Sir William Betham's *Origin and History of the Constitution of England, and of the Early Parliaments of Ireland*, chap. xiii., pages 378, 379. Dublin, 1834, 8vo.

English jurisdiction in the four Leinster shires¹ towards defraying the charges incurred in serving against the Irish.² Besides, an Act was then passed establishing free warren in the manor of Maynooth for the earl.

King Henry VII.⁴ held five parliaments in Ireland, and to one of these particularly great historical and political importance has been attached. Although a partisan of the Yorkists, who were powerful in Ireland, the Earl of Kildare was, nevertheless, continued in his post, and for a considerable time after the king's accession.⁵ In 1485, the first year of Henry VII.'s accession, his deputy held a parliament at Trim.⁶ Again, the Earl of Kildare summoned a parliament, on the 4th of June, 1486.⁷ The pretensions of Lambert Simmel to the English throne were espoused by the lord deputy; and after the Pretender's coronation in Christ Church Cathedral, he was made to summon a parliament in Dublin. Then laws were enacted, and subsidies were granted.⁸

But of all others, the most memorable was that parliament convened at Drogheda.⁹ The king feared the Yorkist influences, which were very strong in Ireland, and he desired to curb them by an astute expedient. When Sir Edward Poynings had been sent to Ireland as vicegerent, in 1494, he summoned a parliament to meet there, in the tenth year of King Henry VII.'s reign, A.D. 1495, and on

¹ See John T. Gilbert's *History of the Viceroy's of Ireland*, chap. xi., page 421.

² See *The Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, page 45.

³ Taken from the D'Alton MSS.

⁴ He reigned from the 22nd of August, 1485, to the 21st of April, 1509.

⁵ See Thomas Moore's *History of Ireland*, vol. iii., chap. xlv., pages 197, 198.

⁶ See *The Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, page 45.

⁷ See Sir James Ware's *Rerum Hibernicarum Annales, regnantibus Henrico VII. Henrico VIII. Edwardo VI. et Maria*, A.C. MCCCCLXXXVI., page 5. Dublinii, 1664, fol.

⁸ An Act passed in the 10th Henry VII., A.D. 1494, ordained that all the statutes then passed "be incorporate and written in two books, one of them to be in the king's chiefe place, and another to be in the common place."

⁹ A very excellent and impartial account of this assembly, and of their proceedings, may be found in Rev. Dr. Leland's *History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II.*, vol. ii., Book iii., chap. v., pages 102-108; also Appendix, pages 505-509.

Monday after the feast of St. Andrew. The statutes there passed had a remarkable effect on the constitution of Ireland; for no freedom of originating laws was allowed in the native parliament until the heads of bills had been first approved by the English king and his council. The original acts of the English parliament, from the twelfth year of Henry VII. to the present time, are still preserved in the custody of the Clerk of the Houses of Lords and Commons in England.¹ During that reign a parliament was held at Castledermot, by Gerald, eighth Earl of Kildare.² Again, in 1508, the same Gerald convoked a parliament in Dublin.³ The common and statute laws of England, framed before the tenth year of the reign of King Henry VII., were also enacted and established in Ireland.

King Henry VIII.⁴ held six parliaments in Ireland, and during his time the viceroys exercised almost regal powers. From the commencement of this reign, for the first time appear the proceedings of parliament in England among the records.⁵ In 1515, on the 25th of January, Gerald, ninth Earl of Kildare, held a parliament in Dublin. Likewise, in March, 1517, he assembled there another parliament. Again, in May, 1525, the Earl of Kildare held a parliament in Dublin.⁶ Another parliament was convened in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of King Henry VIII., at Dublin.⁷ In this the three estates were assembled. These consented that the provinces of Ulster and Leinster, and that all the lands of the Anglo-Irish absentees, should be granted and confirmed and established to the king, as also to his heirs

¹ See *General Report to the King in Council from the Honourable Board of Commissioners on the Public Records appointed by His Majesty King William IV.*, page 75. London, 1837, large folio.

² See *The Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, page 58.

³ See *ibid.*, page 66.

⁴ He reigned from the 22nd of April, 1509, to the 28th of January, 1547.

⁵ See *General Report to the King in Council from the Honourable Board of Commissioners on the Public Records*, page 75.

⁶ See *The Earls of Kildare*, by the Marquis of Kildare, pp. 82, 97.

⁷ See *The Statutes at Large, passed in the Parliaments held in Ireland*, vol. i., A.D. 1537, chap. iv., pp. 89, 90.

and successors.¹ The rolls of this parliament² contain an Act declaring the effect of Poynings' Act,³ and alluding to its repeal. During this reign, a recommendation to have the Irish statutes printed⁴ was overlooked or neglected. The Anglo-Irish colonists owned allegiance to the English monarch as lord paramount over them; but it was only in 1542 that parliament conferred upon King Henry VIII. the title, King of Ireland.⁵ Only within a few cities or towns, and in limited tracts of country surrounding them, was his rule acknowledged. In all other places, the island was ruled by native chieftains, under their own peculiar clan system, and regulated by the Brehon law.

We find no account of any parliament held in Ireland during the time of King Edward VI.,⁶ although it is on record, that on the 5th of August, A.D. 1550, he wrote to the Irish Lord Deputy, empowering him to summon one, when he deemed it expedient.⁷

The two first years of Queen Mary's reign⁸ were spent in one parliament. Her Deputy, Sussex, was directed to convene a parliament; and accordingly, the Lords and Commons assembled on the 1st day of June, 1556. To this the great business of re-establishing the ancient faith and

¹ See *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, 1603-1624*, edited by J. S. Brewer, M.A., and William Bullen, Esq., page 458.

² Cap. 31.

³ See twenty-eighth year of King Henry VIII., A.D. 1537, cap. xx., in *The Statutes at Large, passed in the Parliaments held in Ireland*, vol. i., pp. 157-159.

⁴ By Mr. Justice Luttrell, in his *Booke to the King's Commissioners in Ireland*, A.D. 1537.

⁵ See *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, 1603-1624*, page 458.

⁶ He reigned from the 28th of January, 1547, to the 6th of July, 1553. See Sir James Ware's *Rerum Hibernicarum Annales, regnantibus Henrico VII. Henrico VIII. Eduardo VI. et Maria*, pages 176-179.

⁷ This letter, written in the king's name, is signed E. Somerset, in the Chancery Rolls of 5 Edward VI.

⁸ This is computed from the 6th of July, 1553; but, when she married Philip, King of Spain, on the 25th of July, 1554, a change took place as well in noting her regnal years as in her titles. The latter date became the first day of the first and second year of the reign of Philip and Mary. Queen Mary died on the 17th of November, in the fifth and sixth of Philip and Mary, 1558.

worship was committed.¹ However, in the constitutional sense, to put an end to future contest and debate, the intent and meaning of Poynings' law was formally defined by that parliament.² This proceeding was in favour of Irish legislative independence.

During the first twenty-seven years of Queen Elizabeth's reign,³ five parliaments of her convocation were held in Ireland. The second year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, on the 11th day of January, 1560, a parliament was held.⁴ The roll of this was preserved in the Newman offices.⁵ He was Keeper of the Records in Dublin, in the time of James I.⁶ In the House of Commons, representatives were summoned for ten counties only, the rest were citizens and burgesses of those towns in which the royal authority was predominant; and altogether, the members in that assembly numbered seventy-six.⁷ As this parliament had been summoned chiefly to promote the Reformed religion in Ireland, the Lord Deputy Sussex experienced so much opposition, that after sitting from the 12th of January to the 12th of February, he was obliged to pronounce its dissolution. A parliament was held at Dublin, 23rd of February, 1567.⁸ After various vigorous contests regarding the illegal constitution of the House of Commons, and much confusion, several

¹ See Very Rev. Dr. Laurence F. Renehan's *Collections on Irish Church History*, edited by Rev. Daniel M'Carthy, vol. i., page 8. Dublin, 1861, 8vo.

² See Rev. Dr. Leland's *History of Ireland, from the Invasion of Henry II.*, vol. ii., Book iii., chap. viii., page 212.

³ It lasted from November 17th, 1558, until she died, on the 24th of March, 1603.

⁴ The names of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and of the knights and representatives are to be found in James Hardiman's *Statute of the Fortieth Year of King Edward III.*, &c. Edited, in the *Statute of Kilkenny*, for the Irish Archæological Society, Appendix, No. ii., pp. 134-138.

⁵ See *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts*, preserved in the Archbishopal Library at Lambeth, 1603-1624, page 314.

⁶ See *ibid.*, page 338.

⁷ See Dr. Leland's *History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II.*, vol. ii., book iv., chap. i., pp. 224-226.

⁸ See *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts*, preserved in the Archbishopal Library at Lambeth, 1603-1624, Appendix, page 455.

prorogations took place to the thirteenth year of Elizabeth.¹

When twenty-seven years of her reign elapsed, a parliament was again summoned.² Probably, owing to anticipated opposition from the members, as also to the disturbed state of Ireland, and to the great difficulty of bringing the knights and burgesses together, that assembly had not been previously convened. The country of the Pale was then greatly wasted, owing to the Irish incursions and arbitrary orders issued in council for the imposition of taxes. These causes aroused a spirit of opposition and dissatisfaction among the Anglo-Irish subjects. A remonstrance to the Lord Lieutenant, Sir Henry Sydney, against a system of taxation so oppressive and unconstitutional followed. Confidential agents were despatched to England, with a remonstrance signed by several lords and gentlemen of the Pale. At first, those agents were committed to the tower, as if they had been deemed guilty of high treason; but the dangerous consequences to be apprehended in Ireland of prosecuting them further were soon recognized, and they were dismissed with a caution, while the politic Sir John Perrot was sent over to act as the Queen's deputy.

¹ In the time of Sir Henry Sydney's viceroyalty, the Irish statutes were first printed. The following statement is found in the manuscript classed Titus B. IX. of the Cotton collection, in the British Museum:—"The statutes of Ireland from the 10th yere of King Henrie the Sixt to the thirteenth yere of the Queene's Ma^{tie} that now is, printed at London, 1572, by the procurement of Sir Henry Sydney, Knight of the Garter, lord president of Wales and lord deputy of Ireland, having sumoned all the Justices of both benches, with the chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the Mr of the Rolls, and referred to them the copying out and examining of all the statutes as were of Record and not published; which they did, and delivered the same perfectly written and examined, with all their hands subscribed to every one of them." A copy of this work, so important for a knowledge of the early Irish statutes, is not to be found in any public library of Ireland. It was printed by R. Tottell, in London.

² In James Hardiman's *Statute of the Fortieth year of King Edward III.*, &c., the names of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, as also those of the shires or counties and of the cities and boroughs are set forth. See Appendix No. iii., pp. 139-142.

³ The orders to regulate proceedings in the "Lower or Comen House of Parlyament" are also very interesting for the historical and political student. See *ibid.*, page 143.

In the new parliament, no effort was made to forward the Reformed religion ; and the first attempt of the court party was to move for a suspension of Poynings' law. Most of the transmitted bills were opposed ; but, finding the parliament in a disposition to maintain the rights of Ireland against all demands and instructions from England, the crown minister prorogued it, after a short session of opposition. The second session of this parliament opened on the 26th of April, 1586. This was the third and last parliament of Queen Elizabeth.

Only two or three shires in Leinster, and a few corporate towns in Munster, at this period, were preserved, and with great difficulty, from the native Irish inroads. All the other districts of Ireland were either exempt from English law and government, or they were so devoid of garrisons, that writs could not run therein, nor could cess or dues be exacted for the necessities of the State. Wherefore, supplies and munitions of war had mainly to be borne at the charge of the English exchequer, in order to maintain the Irish establishment. The thrifty Queen frequently complained of those heavy expenses incurred by her deputies in Ireland, while she very grudgingly submitted to the constant drains on her resources, but which were found necessary to support her title and supremacy in the kingdom of Ireland. Moreover, the ancient Anglo-Norman barons there had been so wasted and reduced in their large estates, that they were in great poverty, and unable to support their dignities in the Upper House of Parliament. In those days, many of the Pale esquires were created barons, to fill up a void among the ancient and higher nobility.

JOHN CANON O'HANLON.

THE LIVING ROSARY IN DETAIL.

I.—A PROLOGUS GALEATUS.

TO the general account of the Living Rosary, which I have already supplied in the I. E. RECORD of last September, I shall now have to add a detailed account. This I shall be compelled to divide into three articles. The first will be devoted to establishing the doctrine already laid down in general in my last article, and showing how it all applies to Ireland; for, unless I do this, it will be idle to proceed from general principles unadmitted to what is more particular. It will thus form a sort of *Prologus Galeatus* to the coming treatise. The second article will set down in accurate detail the whole machinery of the Living Rosary sodality. And the third will treat of the practical working of this machinery, so as to secure the smoothest movement and the best results. This, I hope, will exhaust the subject.

How, then, about the two statements in my article, which seem to have occasioned the “wide-spread feeling of uneasiness among the Irish clergy” vouched for on page 942 of last October’s I. E. RECORD?

First, does the legitimate source of authority over the Living Rosary in Ireland reside in the Irish Dominican Provincial, and in him alone?

My answer is in the affirmative.

On page 945 of last October’s I. E. RECORD, the question is answered in the negative:—

“All the requisite faculties for instituting and carrying on the sodalities of the Living Rosary can be obtained, as they always have been, from our bishops, who have, in the comprehensive words of the *Instruction*¹ already referred to, the power to erect *quascumque sodalitates a S. Sede approbatas*, and to bless the beads and scapulars pertaining to them.”

Now the words of the *Instruction* referred to do not warrant this statement. Let us examine it in detail.

The document in question is a letter addressed by the

¹ *Instr. S. Cong. de Prop. Fide*, June, 1889, I. E. RECORD, September, 1889, page 850.

Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda to the bishops subject to his Congregation, in order to communicate to them certain information. It consists of three parts: the first declares that the Congregation possesses from the Holy See the power of granting certain faculties to the bishops; the second explains how these faculties work when granted; the third gives information on certain kindred subjects, which do not, however, enter into the present discussion. The following is the text of the letter, a few unimportant omissions being made here and there for the sake of clearness. In the first part are contained four statements:—

“A. 1. Authority had for a long time past been granted to this Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda of the Faith for giving to Archbishops, Bishops, &c. . . . the power of erecting in places subject to them pious sodalities of what kind soever approved of by the Holy See

“B. 2. But after it had been determined by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Sacred Relics, issued 16th July, 1887, with regard to the Confraternities of the Most Holy Trinity, of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel, and of the Seven Dolours, that they should not be erected unless letters granting faculties for their erection had been previously sought and obtained from the respective Superiors of the Orders existing at the time, it was doubted by some as to whether the aforesaid decree did not regard missionary places also where many circumstances occur to prevent what is ordered by it from being conveniently put into execution.

“C. 3. Consequently, to remove all ambiguity” [the Holy Father . . . declared] “that this Sacred Council of the Propagation of the Faith could continue to use the same faculties regarding the erection of confraternities approved of by the Holy See, which it had before the promulgation of the aforesaid decree of the 16th July, 1887.

“D. 4. And in an Audience . . . His Holiness has ordered moreover, that, notwithstanding any previous prohibition of the Holy See, power might be freely given to erect even Confraternities of the Most Sacred Rosary—in such a way, however, that the faithful ascribed to them only gain the indulgences granted in common to all canonically erected confraternities in general.”

Then comes the second part of the *Instruction*, which shows how such faculties work when granted, both with regard to confraternities in general, and to the Confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary in particular:—

“E. 1. The Superiors of Missions, then, who are subject to

this Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, must know that they can validly and lawfully exercise the faculties to be made over (*faciendas*) to them by it . . . without being first bound to ask for or obtain the permission or assent of any Superior of any regular Order whatsoever.

“F. 2. However, with regard to the Confraternities of the Most Sacred Rosary, if they want them so organized as to enjoy those special indulgences which belong to confraternities erected by the authority of the Master-General of the Order of Preachers, then it is necessary for them to have recourse to him.”

This is the only portion of the *Instruction* that bears on the point under discussion.

Now it is quite evident that the first part of this *Instruction* has reference exclusively to the powers of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda itself, not to the powers of the bishops under Propaganda. It simply declares, under the section I have lettered A, that Propaganda for a long time past had possessed the powers of enabling bishops to erect confraternities, &c. ; under B, that doubt had been thrown upon this ; under C, that the Pope had removed that doubt and declared that the Congregation could go on using its powers ; and, under D, that this even applied (though in a restricted way) to the Congregation of the Most Sacred Rosary. Section A, which states that Propaganda has enjoyed these powers of enabling bishops to erect confraternities independently of the regular prelate, says nothing about its actually employing them ; much less does it declare that it thereby communicates them indiscriminately to all bishops. It only states that the Congregation *has* the powers to communicate, if it sees fit. And yet this very section has been quoted (October I. E. RECORD, 1890, page 944) as an all-sufficient proof of the Irish bishops having actually received these powers from Propaganda. They could have received them ; therefore they have ; such has been the inference—an inference from *posse* to *esse*.

Then, with regard to the second part of the *Instruction*, section E is just as powerless in proving that these extraordinary powers have been communicated to the Irish bishops. It says Superiors of Missions can exercise the faculties *to be made over to them ; i. e., which will, may, or can*

be made over to them (*faciendas*, the gerundive participle, employed for lack of a future participle passive); not which *have been*, or *are hereby*, made over to them; for in this case the word to have been used would have been, not *faciendas*, but *factas*.

The *Instruction* then proves absolutely nothing as to the fact of the Irish bishops having received these powers from Propaganda. When a bishop wishes to receive any extraordinary powers from that or any other Congregation, which are not contained in his ordinary formula, he has to petition for them; and until his petition is granted by an express document, he, of course, does not possess them. It is needless to state that the powers in question are not contained in the Formula Sexta.

Now, either personally or through others, I have consulted several Irish bishops on this point, and have received from each an assurance that these powers have not been conceded to him. One of them did me the extreme courtesy to show me the papers he received from Propaganda on his application for full powers as to the Rosary and other confraternities. These were the very same that priests get (though with the right to delegate) for blessing beads, enrolling in confraternities, &c., but not for *erecting* confraternities or sodalities. To another bishop even *those* faculties were refused, quite lately, on his application for their renewal. And I doubt whether any bishop in this country is in possession of the other faculties here in question.

Being now in possession of the *fact*, viz., that the Dominican Provincial in Ireland, and he alone, is the legitimate superior of the Living Rosary sodality, it might be useful, perhaps, to inquire whether the Sacred Congregation is ever likely to give the bishops in Ireland an independent share in his powers. Light on the subject may be obtained, I think, from section B of the *Instruction*. There the reason is insinuated which would move Propaganda to place such extraordinary powers in the hands of bishops; namely, the existence of "*loca Missionum in quibus plura rerum adjuncta prohibent quominus quae per illud (Decretum,*

16 *Julii*, 1887), *praecipuntur commode possint executioni mandari.*" In Ireland, however, where there are so many Orders, in so many towns, it is quite easy to communicate with their Provincials and obtain the requisite faculties from them; so that it is not easy to see what reason there would be to incline the Sacred Congregation to supersede the ordinary disposition of ecclesiastical legislation. We are not in the wilds of Borneo or Patagonia, where either there are no Religious Orders existing, or where communication with the centre of authority would be extremely difficult, if not quite impossible.

Again, we may prove the mind of the Sacred Congregation from the formula in which it concedes to bishops as well as to priests, both secular and regular, in this country, the power of enrolling¹ the faithful in the different confraternities, and blessing the appropriate beads and scapulars. In this regular printed form the clause occurs: "*exceptio locis ubi adsunt Regulares ex privilegio sui Ordinis ejusmodi facultate gaudentes.*" That is to say, the Sacred Congregation never intends to have two independent and rival founts of authority in the same place. And this reason seems to me so conclusive, that I should not wonder at the clause being left even were the formula issued to a bishop in Thibet or Tartary.

We may test the mind of the Congregation in yet another way. In the formulas issued by the Generals of Religious Orders empowering priests, whether secular or of a different Order, to enroll, bless, &c., a precisely similar restrictive clause is uniformly to be met with. Now the mind of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda cannot be different from the mind of the heads of Religious Orders; for it would be absurd to imagine that there could be two diverse and opposed interests in the Church as regards the communication of its spiritual treasures. Both secular and regular prelates are commissioned by the same Apostolic authority, they are both equally anxious to act upon their commission of beneficence, and they are both equally concerned that the

¹ Not, however, it will be observed, of *erecting* a confraternity.

distribution of spiritual treasures should take place in a uniform and orderly way. There must be no strife, no contention, between the dispensers of the merits of Christ and His saints.

I should scarcely deem it likely then that the Sacred Congregation would interfere in Ireland with what has hitherto worked so well. With regard to the Living Rosary sodality, I can answer for the fact, that since it fell into the hands of the Order by the brief of 1877, priests in different parts of the country have continuously applied to the Irish Dominican Provincial for faculties as directors, and have received them from him, in due course, by means of a regular printed diploma, the terms of which I shall publish further on.

It is not right, then, to say that the brief of 1877, *Quod jure haereditario*, is "hitherto unheard of by most priests" (I. E. RECORD, Oct., 1890, page 942, line 7); or that the consequences of my teaching are "sweeping and revolutionary in their character" (page 944, line 2); or that "Father Byrne's article on the Living Rosary, so far as it concerns this country, might as well never have been written" (page 945, line 13); or that "its teaching need not excite the least uneasiness in the mind of any priest" (*ibid.*). For, as I have just stated, the brief of 1877 *has* been heard of by a great many priests (though at the date of its issue the I. E. RECORD was not in existence to record it), and they have obeyed its authority, and applied for and received their faculties from the legitimate source. The consequences of my teaching are not "revolutionary," for it must be remembered that, in addition to the priests just spoken of, there must necessarily be a considerable number alive now who date their appointment as Living Rosary directors from before 1877, and who have quietly and legitimately held on their sodalities without any disturbance whatsoever. Moreover, I fail to see how a change made or imposed by the legitimate authority (the Church) could in any way be justly styled "revolutionary." I have proved that my teaching *does* concern this country, and if there should chance to be any priest, who, believing himself to be a Living Rosary director, has neither received his appointment on or prior to

the 15th of November, 1877, nor from the Dominican prelate after that date, such an one may very well feel considerable uneasiness in his mind, which nothing should be able to dispel short of a document from Propaganda expressly authorizing his bishop to appoint him Living Rosary director, or a diploma of directorate from the Irish Dominican Provincial.

It now remains for me to ask and answer the question : Is the use of beads bearing the Dominican blessing a necessary condition for gaining the indulgences of the Living Rosary?

I have already indicated my position with regard to this point in the following broad proposition :—"To gain the indulgences of the Living Rosary, which are very numerous, one must be legitimately admitted into the sodality, and use beads bearing the Dominican blessing" (I. E. RECORD, Sept. 1890, page 820, line 8, *a fine*).

I must observe that when I wrote the above, I had no idea at all of giving explicit and detailed information concerning the Living Rosary indulgences and the conditions required for gaining them. Hence my statement, though perfectly true, is very incomplete, and needs considerable evolution, in order to be adequately understood. Any person accurately acquainted with the full official elenchus of these indulgences would at once see the practical necessity of my remark, and would understand it in its true bearing ; those not possessed of this accurate acquaintance would, I trusted, accept the statement on authority, follow its teaching—which would cost them no trouble—and be made happy by gaining all the indulgences indiscriminately, without having to stop to inquire : "Have I a right to this?" or, "Must I stop short at that?"

I shall now lay before the reader the full truth as regards this question, accurately expressed in every detail. I shall then show how it is in no way and in no point contradictory to the proposition I have already laid down. This, I hope, will free me from any further obligation of dealing with this contentious matter, and will leave me at liberty to evolve in

detail what remains to be said concerning the machinery and working of the Living Rosary sodality.

The indulgences of the Living Rosary may be conveniently arranged, for the purposes of this discussion, in the following order, according to the various dates of their concession :—

First, those granted by Pope Gregory XVI., by the brief *Benedicentes Domino*, dated 27th January, 1832. These are :

A. (1) “ A plenary indulgence the first holiday after admission to the sodality. Conditions : Confession and Communion.

B. (2) “ The indulgences which the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, have decreed for the recitation of the Rosary.” No condition mentioned, or indulgences explicitly defined.

C. (3) “ An indulgence of one hundred days as often as the part of the Rosary fixed by the rule of the pious exercise is recited on ferial days ; and an indulgence of seven years, with as many quarantines, if the same work is religiously performed on Sundays and other feast days throughout the year, those even from which the precept of hearing mass has been taken away, and throughout the octaves of the Birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, Resurrection, Corpus Christi, Pentecost, and the Assumption, Birth, and Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. ”

D. (4) A plenary indulgence, on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, All Saints, and the third Sunday of each month. Conditions : the previous recitation of the daily decade for at least a month, unless the person is prevented by a legitimate cause ; Confession and Communion on the days mentioned ; and “ *piæ preces in aliqua ecclesia.* ”

It must be noticed, under B, that the Pope does not state definitely what these indulgences are, and says nothing at all about their conditions. We must understand, consequently, that, looking on this Living Rosary as the same species of devotion as the well-known Dominican Rosary, which is always understood whenever the Rosary is mentioned without any peculiar epithet, he simply declared that the indulgences already in force for the recital of the Rosary applied to it in its own measure, and, of course, on the same conditions. Now, the only indulgences granted to *the faithful in general* before his time, for the mere recitation of the Rosary were, to judge from the official elenchus published by the Dominican General, those of Benedict XIII. by bull *Sanctissimus*, 13th April, 1726, which consisted

of one hundred days for each "Our Father" and "Hail, Mary," provided the Rosaries were blessed by priests of the Order of Preachers, and that at least the third part of the Rosary were recited. If this was kept up for a year, a plenary indulgence might be gained on any day after fulfilling the usual conditions of confession and communion. Now, as the Living Rosary is the Rosary, not of fifteen, or of five, but of single mysteries (I. E. RECORD, Sept., 1890, page 816, line 24), if we substitute for the minimum recitation of five decades required by Benedict XIII. the recital of the single decade required by the rule of the Living Rosary, we shall see plainly and definitely what indulgences are to be understood under clause B. We shall see also, as a necessary consequence, that to gain them the beads must have been blessed by a Dominican priest.

The next grant of indulgences is by rescript of Gregory XVI., 7th June, 1839, for the benefit of the *officials* of the sodality:—

E. "1. 100 days to *Zelators*, for fulfilment of any of their duties.

"2. 300 days to presidents of at least eleven *Zelators*, for the same."

These indulgences, of course, cannot concern beads.

The next addition to the indulgences of the Living Rosary is to be found in the authentic appendix to the *Raccolta* approved of by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgence and Sacred Relics, 8th May, 1865. To avoid repetitions, I will merely state that to this date we may assign the addition of the following feasts to the days on which may be gained the plenary indulgences marked D. The feasts of our Lord's Birth, Circumcision, Epiphany, Resurrection and Ascension, Corpus Christi, Pentecost, Trinity; all the feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whether great or small, provided they are celebrated by the whole Church.

At this juncture the present Archbishop of Dublin published a list of the Living Rosary indulgences in the I. E. RECORD, May, 1871, exactly corresponding with those I have now recorded, except that he left undefined the class of

indulgences I have marked B. Nothing else certainly could have been expected at that date; for it was not till 1878 that the exact extent of this class of indulgences was put beyond a doubt by an authentic document of the Sacred Congregation. No wonder also that he stated in a second article (I. E. RECORD, June, 1871), that "for the indulgence of the Living Rosary neither the use nor the possession of beads, medals, &c., is required. Gregory XVI., in granting these indulgences, prescribed only the recitation of the prayers, according to the rules of the association; and these make no mention of any such condition." Here it will be seen that the archbishop did not even regard the Living Rosary as anything particularly Dominican in character; he speaks of the indulgences in quite the same breath as those known as the "Apostolic," to obtain which the possession of a blessed medal (!) is sufficient. And no wonder, for it was not till six years later that the devotion was declared by Apostolic authority to be Dominican *jure hereditario*. It is just as unfair then to Dr. Walsh to quote him as an authority on the present legislation of the Living Rosary sodality as it would be to St. Thomas of Aquin to quote him as an authority on the present state of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

Not Dr. Walsh alone, but the Vicar-General of the order, Father Joseph M. Sanvito, writing as "Supremus Moderator" of the sodality, 15th November, 1877, avoids insisting on the necessity of the Dominican blessing, which had not as yet been expressly insisted upon by Apostolic authority. His words at that date (three months after the brief *Quod jure hereditario*) are simply these:—

"In posterum autem, ut quis in Sodalitatem Rosarii-Viventis legitime co-optetur et lucretur Indulgentias huic Sodalitati concessas, necessarium erit illum eligi aut approbari ab aliqua Zelatrice seu Zelatore, qui ipse approbatus seu institutus fuerit ab aliquo legitimo Rosarii Viventis Directore."

The next event of the little history I am tracing occurred 2nd February, 1878. This was the issuing of an authentic "Summarium Indulgentiarum" for the Living Rosary, by the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Sacred Relics.

To be brief, it sets down the indulgences exactly as I have done above, evolving those marked B as follows :—

“IV. Indulgentias omnibus fidelibus Rosarium recitantibus ab Apostolica Sede usque ad annum 1832 concessas (Greg. XVI in Brevi *Benedicentes*, 27th Jan. 1832), et ideo. 1, centum dies pro quolibet *Pater* et quolibet *Ave*, dummodo utantur corona precatoria de more benedicta per aliquem Sacerdotem Ordinis Praedicatorum (Benedictus XIII, April. 1726), vel per alium Sacerdotem, qui a Rmo Ordinis Magistro Generali facultatem Rosaria benedicendi obtinuerit; 2, in die a singulis Sodalibus semel quotannis eligenda Indulgentiam Plenariam defunctis applicabilem, si contriti, confessi, et sacra communione refecti, consuetas preces juxta intentiones Summi Pontificis effuderint, dummodo quotidianam decadem per integrum annum recitaverint, utendo corona ut supra benedicta.”

The “Summarium” concludes :—

“Sacra Congregatio, Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, Indulgentias in praesenti Summario contentas uti authenticas recognovit, proindeque typis imprimi ac publicar posse censuit.

“Datum ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis, die 2 Februarii, 1878.

“AL. CARD. OREGLIA A S. STEPHANO, *Praef.*

“Loco ✠ sigilli.

“A. PANICI, *Secretarius.*”

I publish this termination to emphasize the authenticity of the document, which is by no means to be considered a mere unauthenticated sheet, but an instrument possessed of legislative force. For it is issued with the same authority and formality as any other decree of the Sacred Congregation.

The matter being now decided beyond doubt or question with regard to indulgences B, the Vicar-General of the Order wrote as follows, 5th June, 1879, among other authoritative declarations as “Supremus Moderator” :—

“Ad lucrandas indulgentias huic Sodalitati non semel concessas, atque in Summario a S. Congregatione, sub die 2 Februarii, 1878, approbato designatas, singuli Sodales ab aliquo legitimo Zelatore admitti necesse habent, atque ‘uti corona precatoria de more benedicta per aliquem Sacerdotem Ordinis Praedicatorum, vel per alium Sacerdotem, qui a Rmo Ordinis Magistro Generali facultatem benedicendi Rosaria obtinuerit.’” (Summ.)

The same language is used by the Master-General,

Father Joseph M. Larroca, 22nd April, 1887, speaking with the same authority as "Supremus Moderator":—

"Ad lucrandas indulgentias Sodalitati Rosarii Viventis non semel concessas vel in posterum concedendas, singuli Sodales ab aliquo legitimo Zelatore admitti necesse habent.

"Etiam necesse est prædictos Sodales uti corona precatoria, de more benedicta per aliquem sacerdotem Ordinis Prædicatorum, vel per alium sacerdotem, qui a Rmo Ordinis Magistro Generali facultatem benedicendi Rosaria obtinuerit."

Now, it will be noticed that the two Generals do not say that the use of Dominican beads is necessary for the acquisition of *each and every* indulgence. They simply say: "ad lucrandas indulgentias huic sodalitati concessas." "The indulgences conceded" is a term to be understood collectively, not distributively, and, of course, means in order to gain the *entire body* of the Living Rosary indulgences. That is, if you do not use Dominican beads, you will not gain *all*, you will lose *some*. The words of the Generals cannot impose any further necessity than that already imposed by Apostolic authority, as, of course, to do so would be to exceed the functions of a "Supremus Moderator," and assume those of a Congregation.

Now, taking into consideration the universal and unbroken tradition in the Church, which for so many ages had allied the use of the beads¹ to the use of the prayers—taking into consideration the fact that the Living Rosary by the brief *Quod jure hæreditario* had been so emphatically declared to be of Dominican lineage and a branch of the old Dominican stock, taking into consideration that at some future period, when, by long and undisputed possession, the Living Rosary sodality would have become unmistakably Dominican in its character of a regular training-ground for candidates to the great Rosary Confraternity, that then the Sacred Congregation might by no means improbably affix by an express decree the use of the Dominican beads as a necessary condition to the acquirement of all the indulgences without distinction,

¹ I use this word, of course, in its modern sense, signifying the "corona," not in the archaic English sense of the word, meaning "prayers."

it may very well be supposed that the two Dominican Generals, with the prudence and foresight of true prelates and legislators, chose their language with deliberation, and adopted a form of words which would be perfectly well adapted to existing circumstances, and would at the same time indicate the direction in which they desired the current of events to tend. For as "Supremi Moderatores" they had a perfect right to prescribe the use of Dominican beads as of precept, even though not a necessary condition for the gaining of each and every indulgence. By this means too a plain and simple *norma agendi* would be provided for the faithful, by means of which they would gain every indulgence and avoid unnecessary mental confusion as to the fulfilment of the conditions.

I understand the words of the Supremi Moderatores, then, in the sense of a precept, indicating their desire concerning the use of Dominican beads in all cases. I do not, however, and did not, consider that negligence to fulfil this precept would entail the loss of indulgences C and D. I do, however, and did, consider that such non-conformity would entail the loss of indulgences B.

Finally, in practice, this requirement of the use of Dominican beads will present no difficulty; for priests, when receiving the diploma of Directorate from the Irish Dominican Provincial, receive at the same time power to confer the Dominican blessing. This diploma, which has been in use in Ireland for the last fourteen years, runs as follows :—

Nos. Fr.

Prior Provincialis Hiberniae Ordinis Praedicatorum.

Inter principales Officii nostri partes esse reputamus, ut magis in dies propagetur et floreat devotio erga Beatissimam Deiparam ejusque Rosarium, quod haereditario jure ad Ordinem nostrum pertinere saepius ab Apostolica Sede declaratum est. Cum igitur SS. D. N. fel. rec. Pius PP. IX. per Brev. sub die 17 Aug. 1877. Supremam Rosarii Viventis moderationem Magistro Generali Ordinis nostri commiserit, Nos, Ejus delegatione, Te . . . instituimus, et facimus Directorem Rosarii Viventis in civitate seu loco qui vulgari vocabulo dicitur . . . institutumque decernimus et declaramus cum omnibus juribus et gratiis,

quae talium Directorum muneri seu officio competere dignoscuntur.

In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Datum . . . in Conv. N. . . . die . . . Mense, 18.

Fr. —, *Prior Provincialis Hiberniae.*

Fr. —, *a Secretis.*

Reg. Fol.

T. M. BYRNE, O.P.

ANECDOTA OXONIENSIA.¹

THE *Book of Lismore* is a large vellum MS. of the fifteenth century, preserved in Lismore Castle, Co. Waterford, and belonging to the Duke of Devonshire. The present volume contains, extracted therefrom, the Lives of SS. Patrick, Columba, Brigit, Senan, Finnian of Clonard, Finnchu of Brigown (Mitchelstown), Brendan of Ardfert, Ciaran of Clonmacnoise, and Mochua of Balla (Mayo).

With respect to the first, the present editor issued in the Rolls' Series, in 1887, *The Tripartite Life of St. Patrick, with other Documents relating to that Saint.* Amongst the latter appears a "Homily," comparison with which shows that the fresh matter contained in the Lismore Life amounts to no more than thirty-seven lines of this edition. With regard to the second and third Lives, homilies on SS. Columba and Brigit were printed (along with that just mentioned) by the editor, in 1877. The only substantial difference between them and those here given consists of four new incidents in the latter Life, equal to forty-seven lines of text. Moreover, most, if not the whole, of what is of linguistic value in the three compositions has been embodied in Windisch's *Dictionary*; whilst the facts, with the exceptions named, have long since passed into popular hagiography. There seems, accordingly, to have been no valid reason for including them in a volume of *Anecdota*.

¹ *Lives of Saints from The Book of Lismore.* Edited by Whitley Stokes, D.C.L. Oxford, 1890.

In reference to the other Lives, it has to be premised that for corrupt transcription *The Book of Lismore* may defy competition. In one place the scribe writes (page 280): "It is not I that am answerable for the meaningless words that are in this Life, but the bad manuscript." Similarly, here and there we find such editorial remarks as: "This is corrupt" (page 65); "the [word] of the MS. is nonsense" (page 161); "here *The Book of Lismore* is very corrupt" (page 228). Of each Life there are two apparently independent copies in other MSS. From these, where divergencies arise, the English version is regularly made, the Lismore text being left untranslated. Why, therefore, the latter has been printed, it is not easy to see; except, perhaps, that it belongs to a Duke. In addition, of the six Lives, no less than five, we learn, are extant in two Latin versions respectively. These, however, are excluded, although the book is swelled to an inordinate length with irrelevant matter.

The preface opens with a diffuse description of the contents of *The Book of Lismore*. Then we have a textual synopsis, long drawn out, in the mode familiar to those who are acquainted with that in *The Tripartite*: horrent with hyphens and asterisks and equation-marks and root-signs, designed to exhibit the language of the Lives. Its practical value is about the same as that of the conspectus in *The Tripartite*. But the terminology is hard to beat. In *depraccoit*, for instance, *a* seems a corruption for *e*. Not so, however: it is "*a* for post-tonic *e*" (page xlv.). Latin *q* for native *c* was hitherto deemed a harmless affectation of scribal learning. All the same, it is "the velar guttural *q*" (page xlviii.). Of noteworthy novelties we have "stems in *-tîon*" (page lvii.), and the editor's best-known discovery, the aorist, is alliteratively divided (pages lxxiv., lxxv.), into *simple* and *sigmatic*. But some examples of the *simple*, it is acutely noted, may possibly be *praeterito-presents* (page lxxiv.)! In the matter of *c* versus *k*, the latter letter is now triumphant. *Ac* and *sec* and *vac*, for instance, of *The Tripartite* (page lxxxvi.) now stand as *ak* and *sek* and *vek* (page lxxv.).

As a specimen of candour, the following is, perhaps,

worthy of note. In the *Stowe Missal* (page 249) *atnopuir Deo* was rendered *he offers them* (i.e., the bread and wine) *to God*. That is, the celebrant pronounces the consecration formula. Whereupon the editor declared *ex cathedra*: "I can say with confidence that in Old-Irish *n* never signifies *them*" (*Academy*, No. 792). In a subsequent number (802) of the same journal evidence to which he could not object was produced, showing that *n* did mean *them*. But the editor would not own his error. Now, however, when the *volte-face* is not likely to be detected, *n* = *them* appears amongst the "infix personal pronouns" (page lxiii). *Quo teneam vultum mutantem Protea nodo?*

Next, we have a list of loan-words. This is not quite complete, whilst it contains nothing original that is of value. To show its accuracy, *caisel* is said (page lxxxiii.) to be derived from *castellum*. The absence of *t* in the native word makes this impossible. Moreover, the meaning is not the same. When the writer in *The Book of Armagh* (fol. 16 d) wanted to latinize *caisel* (i.e., Cashel), he chose, not *castellum*, but *maceria* (stone-wall). Another example will be dealt with later on.

Then comes a lengthy synopsis of the contents, again after the method adopted in *The Tripartite*, with however this, amongst minor differences, that there the collected headings are printed in the ordinary way; whilst here, as befits a university edition, they will be found arranged like the *schema justitiae* in the old editions of St. Thomas (2. 2. q. lvii.). It contains some remarkable items. The most primeval mode of carriage by land was on a human being's back (page c.). The wheeled vehicle called *carpat* was drawn by a pair of horses, and had two hind shafts (*ib.*). Ergo, the car was placed before the horse—a new example of hysteron-proteron. "From the phrase 'they leap on their horses' we may infer the absence of stirrups" (page ci.). *Cailech* (from *calicem*) is the paten (page cvii.). The gospel of St. Ciaran meant "gospelar," "the portions of the Gospels used in the mass" (*ib.*). At the time, of course, there was a fixed Gospel, John vi. 51-57 (*Stowe Missal*, folio 17 b). "Penance; Matrimony, and Holy Orders, are referred to in these Lives ;

but not as sacraments " (page cvii.). Until the editor defines a sacrament, it would be labour in vain to produce evidence to satisfy him. It is to be hoped the definition will not be of a piece with his well-known distinction between the Conception and the Incarnation. Meanwhile our readers will be relieved to find that the Lives contain repentance, confession, and confessor, " who was always a bishop or a priest " (page cxviii.). There is also mention of *lawful connection* (*ib.*).

Perhaps the most important section of its kind in the book is that descriptive (page 72) of the Shannon bearing the box to and from Inis Cathaig, to bring the " sacrifice," in order that nuns might communicate. Compare, it will suffice to observe for the present, the Conciliar decrees quoted in the Royal Irish Academy edition of the *Stowe Missal* (*Antiq.*, xxvii., page 254). To the editor, naturally, it bore no significance. He has, consequently, omitted reference thereto.

We proceed now to inquire how far the text and translation are reliable, and what are the extent and character of the illustrative material. Here most of the errors arise from lack of the intuitive perception which knowledge of the living speech alone can give. As to the text, though the letters of the MS. (as a facsimile prefixed exhibits) are as large as medium-sized capitals, the first thing the student has got to do is to eliminate up to one hundred and forty errata that are corrected at the end. Of these, no less than five are found in the transcript of the two columns represented in the facsimile. Add a sixth: page 97, line 12, for *a n-æninadh*, read *a n-æininadh*. To show the editorial supervision, on the very first page, *potius dicendus est propheta quam evangelista* is given as applied by St. Jerome to Isaiah. But, with charming inconsistency, the nouns change places (*evangelista quam propheta*) later on (page 150). What was the original, and where it is to be found, you will search in vain in this bulky tome. Our readers need scarcely be reminded that the dictum is taken in substance from the *Prologus Galeatus: Quorum primus* (Isaias) *non prophetiam mihi videtur texere, sed evangelium*.

With respect to the translation, here and there quatrains occur (amounting to thirty-two) which the editor admits his inability to master. No rendering is attempted. Moreover, a poem, in twenty-two stanzas, by the poet St. Colman, the founder of Cloyne, is in great part confessedly unintelligible to the editor. The various metrical forms, including the stately measure of St. Colman's verse, have not been explained, nor, consequently, is there any attempt made to attain the meaning by their aid.

In addition, two things have to be premised for the information of the majority of readers who cannot consult the original. First, the English does not always fully represent the Irish. For instance, an incident in the life of St. Senan is rightly described by the editor as "a truly beautiful legend, vulgarized by Thomas Moore in his *St. Senanus and the Lady*" (page 340). Therein we read, according to the translation (page 219): "'Go,' saith Senan, 'to thy sister, who dwells in yon island,'" &c. But the text (page 72) has: "'O Canair, go,' saith Senan, 'to my mother, thy sister,'" &c. (*A Chanir . . . docum mo máthar, do sethar*). The beauty, it will scarcely be denied, is enhanced by the bond of kindred thus revealed.

Secondly, the arrangement of the text is not always adhered to in the translation. Here is a case in point. "'If I should be taken,' saith he, 'I am ready for that.' 'O Odran,' saith Colombcille, 'thou shalt have the reward thereof'" (page 178). Now, take the editorial print (page 30): "*Diam-gabthasa,*" *ol se.* "*As errlam leam sin, a Odhrain,*" *ar Columcille.* "*Ratfia a logh.*" This means: "If I were taken," saith he. "That is acceptable to me," saith Columcille. "Thou shalt have its reward."

As in the text, so here more than seventy corrections (given in the notes, or at the end) must be incorporated before you can with safety attempt to quote. Their nature may be inferred from the following:—"For *sun rose*, read *light appeared*;" "for *of*, read *day before*;" "for *cow-dung which lay before*, read *cloth-cap (?) on the head of*." A cursory perusal on our part has made additions to the list. Here are specimens which our readers who know the native

speech will appreciate. *A lan do ór ocus do argut do chumhdach minn ocus mainisdrech*—"its fill of gold and silver to cover relics and shrines withal" (pages 26, 174). But in the loan-word list *mainisdrech* is said to be from *ministerium*, "a credence-table." The meaning (see *Textual Studies on The Tripartite*, Trans., R.I.A., xxix., page 185) is: *its fill of gold and of silver to make reliquaries and service-sets* (chalices and patens).

Tancatar do bennachadh do Brigit—"they came to be blessed by Brigit" (pages 45, 193). But this rendering would require in the original *da mbennachadh*. The meaning is: they came to salute (pay their respects to) Brigit. Who has not heard of the national greeting, *Dia is Muire dhuit*—"God and Mary [be] for thee" (and the response, *Diais Muire is Padraig dhuit*—"God and Mary and Patrick [be] for thee")? This Christian *benediction* supplanted the pagan *M'ochen* (found *passim* in native secular literature) as a salutation. Thus *bennachadh do* (to give blessing to) came to signify *to salute* (pay respect to).

Focerd menma in coca thairis cur'bhá-slan a sechtmain—"the mind of the cook reflected (?) that his week was complete" (pages 60, 207). But the translation should be: "the mind of the cook passed over it (lit. cast [itself] beyond [the request made], until his (the person who asked) week was complete."

Beir mbiscaidh cidh dodfucc ille—"curse whoever brought thee here" (pages 102, 250). The Irish of this English is *beir mhiscaidh do'nti dodfucc ille*. It is to be rendered: "take [my] curse [with thee]. What brought thee hither?" It shows the completeness of the elaborate linguistic conspectus that this *cidh* is not found amongst the interrogative, nor *do-d-fucc* amongst the infixed, pronouns.

A branch of the O'Conors suffered from the yellow plague. Here is what happened: *roshirset cleirigh coicidh Connacht dia bein dibh ocus ní fhuaratar, cu tancatar airm im-bui Mochua*, "the clerics of the province of Connaught sought to banish it from them, and they succeeded not. So they came to the place where Mochua was dwelling" (pages 143, 287). But one would think this was a matter rather for the

plague-stricken than for the clerics. And so the original says. The scribe, however, led his editor astray. *Cleirigh* (a similar instance of nom. pl. for ac. pl. occurs) is the object, not the subject of *roshirset*. With this obvious explanation the sentence is quite plain. They sought out the clerics of the province of Connaught to take it away from them, and they found not [one to do it] until they came to the place wherein was Mochua.

One time St. Mochua wanted to get in to a lake-island, but the boat was not brought to him. Whereupon he said it would not be required thenceforth. *Tuarcaibh iarsin an talam cu tiaghur do chois innti osin cusaniu*, "Then he raises up the earth, so that one fares on foot into the island from that time till to-day" (pages 143, 287). But *tuarcaibh* (as shown elsewhere in the present text) is used here not in the primary sense of *to raise*, but in the secondary and idiomatic meaning, *to raise* [*the head*], *to rise up*, *to appear*. Hence the rendering is: Uprose after that the earth (from beneath the water), so that one fares a-foot into it from that till to-day.

We conclude with the following, which has a double interest:—*Is ailitre ocus is deoraidecht dam in saegul iar n-intsamail na sruithe remthechtach*—"I have pilgrimage and exile in the world, even as the elders who went before" (pages 22, 170). But, in the first place, *saegul* (world) is nominative; and, secondly, *is*, being a mere copula, can never predicate. The meaning is: "Pilgrimage and exile is the world to me, after the manner of the seniors who went before." At foot is a note: "This is a paraphrase of the Latin, *Advena sum apud te Domine, et peregrinus sicut omnes per mundum*, Ps. xxxix. 12." This "Latin" is taken from the editor's *Three Middle-Irish Homilies* (page 96). In the MS. (*Lebar Breac*) the two last vocables are represented by *p.m.* *World* led the editor to read them into *per mundum*. Such is the biblical knowledge of an Oxford editor. Read *patres mei*, with the reference, Ps. xxxviii. 13.

Similar Scriptural proficiency is displayed in reference to another quotation. In the *Life of St. Columba* is a passgge thus translated (page 168): "'Verily,' saith the Apostle, 'the sons of Abraham are all who resemble him in perfect faith.'"

At foot is a note: "This is a paraphrase of the Latin '*Omnes qui sunt ex fide, hi sunt filii Abraham,*' Gal. iii. 7." Here every third word is a blunder. The reading—what are we come to, when a reviewer has to do such drudgery?—is: *Qui ex fide sunt, ii sunt filii Abrahæ*. But these things pale their ineffectual fires in presence of the Index (page 373), where "John S., Apostle" is differentiated from "John, son of Zebedee!"

"That down to the end of the eleventh century the secular clergy sometimes had wives, appears from the fact that Patrick's grandfather was a deacon" (page cxi.). But, with due respect, "Patrick's grandfather" did not live in Ireland, nor at the end of the eleventh century. This may accordingly pair off with the conclusion in *The Tripartite* (page clviii.), that polygamy existed; and hence St. Patrick, like St. Paul, required for the bishopric of Leinster a husband of one wife. In the editor's exegesis St. Paul's bishops were, accordingly, polygamists; that is, having more than one wife at a time! To show the candour exhibited on this point, here is a native comment on 1 Tim. iii. 2 from the Würzburg *Codex Paulinus* (fol. 28 b) printed and translated (*The Old-Irish Glosses at Würzburg and Carlsruhe*, pages 165, 324) by the editor, but passed over by him in this place and in *The Tripartite*: "*Unius uxoris virum—re nairite graid, iar mbathius*"—*before reception of Order, after Baptism*. That the clergy sometimes had wives, is, no doubt, true; but that either marriage or cohabitation was permitted *after* ordination, not a tittle of evidence has ever been produced to prove or infer.

"Nothing is said of purgatory" (page cvi.). Of course not. The *name* is not found. But, what of the *thing*? If the Ancient Irish Church admitted but heaven and hell, why was a requiem sung "for the repose of the soul of the dead" (page cii.)? Again, why were the following expressions shut out (*ib.*) by the editor?—*Do breith o phein docum nimhe*, "to bring from torment to heaven" (page 18); *ind ithfern*, "in hell" (*ib.*). This is the doctrine attributed to St. Patrick. Yet Dr. Stokes asks us to infer that the Irish Church held that all souls went either straight to heaven or straight to hell (page cvi.).

Of the hundreds of native persons mentioned in the book, in not more than ten instances have the times in which they flourished been supplied. In the historical events, scarce a date has been added. The value of the little given can be readily tested. The editor affects to draw from the sources. Two short excerpts, for instance, taken from the *Annals of Innisfallen* profess to be copied from the *Bodleian MS.* (Rawlinson, b. 503). Withal he has apparently not waked up to the fact that in chronology, as in other things, *The Four Masters* (?) have grown obsolete. Accordingly, he follows them in placing, for example, the death of Bec mac De at A.D. 557 (page 350); of Blathmac, joint-king of Ireland, at A.D. 664 (page 347); of Dubdaleithe, abbot of Kilskeery, County Meath, at A.D. 745 (page 306). The true years, according to the *Annals of Ulster*, are 558, 665, and 750, respectively. "Ob. A.D. 901" applied (page xxxix.) to Cainchomraic, bishop of Clonmacnoise, looks original. The correct date, if we follow the *Ulster Annals*, is A.D. 903.

In connection herewith it is, perhaps, superfluous to observe that the editor does not profess to emulate the example of Dr. Reeves in the *Adamnan*. Results similar to those derived by that ripe scholar from comparison of his text with independent native authorities you will here seek in vain. Such things Dr. Stokes, doubtless, considers as belonging to "those undesigned coincidences, of which," according to him, the present reviewer, "like other theologians, is so fond." Thereby, however, he has let slip an opportunity which those foreigners which he fawns upon so would (if they had the wit to perceive it) give a deal to perceive it, give a deal to possess. Greater, perhaps, than the glory of sending forth an *editio princeps* is the fame of proving that a recension is a forgery. Well, we do not plume ourselves much on being the first to discover that the so-called Life of St. Finnchu in this collection will hardly be accepted *in its present form* until our topography is readjusted and our history rewritten.

In technical chronology, the following deserves notice. On the 8th of the Kalends of February, St. Ciaran set up in Clonmacnoise, on the 10th of the moon, on a Saturday (page

275). He died there after seven months, on the 5th of the Ides of September, on a Saturday, on the 18th of the moon (page 278). The only information the editor gives is a reference to the first passage to prove that the distinction between the solar and lunar months was known (page ciii.). But it needs no great computist to discover at a glance that the two places are utterly at variance. First, the regular letter of January 25th being *d*, and that of September 9th *g*, whenever the former falls on Saturday, the latter (except on a leap year) falls on Tuesday. Secondly, January 25th, Saturday, and moon 10, can concur; but they require September 9th, Tuesday (or Wednesday) and moon 1st. Finally, September 9th and moon 18th cannot coincide, because new moon does not fall on August 23 in any year of the Decemnovennal Cycle.

Worse still, though it lay under his hand, the editor does not say that herein one of the Latin Lives differs essentially from the Irish. The Salamanca Codex gives the first series as January 23rd, Saturday; moon 10. Here from it has been concluded (*Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars*, page 261) that Clonmacnoise was founded on that day and date, A.D. 544. The text, however, is demonstrably corrupt. New moon that year was on January 11th; moon 13, on January 23rd. The same Codex gives the second series as September 9th, Saturday; moon 15; data which are said (*ib.*, page 263) to mark A.D. 544 as the year of the saint's death. But the text is doubly depraved. For in the year in question (Lit. Dom. C, B) September 9th fell on Friday; new moon on September 4th; moon 15 on September 18th (not on September 9th). How to reconcile all these discrepancies is beside the present purpose.

In the Index of Persons a striking evidence of accuracy is the bisection of personages whose names are household words to all students. Thus, "Colman alias MacLenin, 301," and "Colman MacLenin, 251," stand four lines apart (page 370), being thus clearly taken to be different. But they are one and the same, the founder of Cloyne. Again, "Fergus Cennfota MacConaill Gulbain, 301," and "Fergus MacConaill, 159, 171," are placed one after the

other. Plainly, they are understood to be distinct persons. They are the one son of the Conall Gulban (son of Niall of the Nine Hostages, from whom Tirconnell was named. The worst case is, perhaps, that of the well-known king who (page 373) is given as "Loeguire" and (lower in the same column) "Loeguire Mac Neill," with different references.

In the Index of Places no serious effort at identification appears to have been made. The island of Ard Nemid, for instance (page 209-210), a little research would have discovered to be the Great Island, in Cork Harbour. Similarly, Inis Cara (*ib.*) is the parish of that name in Cork County. Sliab Cua is not, of course, as stated (page 381), "Knockmoldown, County Waterford." Furthermore, there is plain evidence that in some cases the Index was compiled without reference to the text. St. Patrick asked for a site for his church on *Druim Sailech* (ridge of sallows), the place where Armagh is to-day (page 165). This *Druim Sailech*, we are informed (page 378), is "a ridge about seven miles south of Roscrea." The northerns came to seize Munster, and encamped by Loch Silenn. They were routed by the Munster men, who cast the heads of the slain into the lake, thenceforth called Loch Cenn (lake of heads) (pages 243, 244). Who can doubt but that the conflict took place in the southern province? But the Oxford topographer (page 380) will have it that the lake is Loch Sheelin, "on the borders of Cavan, Longford and Meath."

The Index of Irish words contains many vocables that have already done duty in *The Tripartite*. The recondite character of the greater portion may be estimated from such items as *aibit*, habit; *aitenndae*, furzy; *all*, cliff; *alt*, a steep; *ancaire*, anchor. Its value is shown in "*leth atóibe*, a connected passage (literally 'side that adheres') " page 385). That is, to take the first example in the book, Isaiah ix. 1 adheres to ix. 2: in other words, verse 1 is *the side that adheres to* verse 2. This is the new Biblical criticism. But the panegyrist did not think thus. He says, rightly, that the *place of adherence* of his text, ix. 2, was ix. 1. The phrase is *leth atóibe* [*th*] *e*, the second word being the genitive of the infinitive. Infected *t* (*th*), not being pronounced, was omitted here and elsewhere in transcription.

Nor is evidence of candour wanting. When hard pressed, the editor quoted (*Academy*, No. 803) from “Lebar Brec. 251a, 68,” to prove that *toibe* is gen. sing. of *toeb*. Whereupon the genuine and corrupt forms (which he had before him when he thus wrote) were, for the second time, made public (*ib.*, No. 816) from the Royal Irish Academy edition of the *Stowe Missal* :—

A—Text, p. 251.
in oíxl in tuib deiss.

B—Text, p. 264 L. B. 251a, 68.
isind achsaill toibe deiss.

(In the armpit of the right side.)

No disproof was essayed. The case is far stronger now. Elsewhere in L. B. (4 a) *taib* in gen. sg. Moreover, the present texts have *taeibh* and *thaeibh*. Notwithstanding, “toibe in L. B. 251a, 68,” and *taebi* in an equally reputable authority, are given (page 401) as “pointing to the *s*-declension” (in which, it has to be remarked, the genitive singular ends in *i*).

The foregoing, which, did space permit, could be added to considerably, will suffice to prove that in dealing with material such as that in question no reliable result is obtainable without a grasp of native idiom, knowledge of Catholic doctrine and discipline, familiarity with chronology, and acquaintance at first-hand with national history.

B. MACCARTHY.

THE CATHOLIC TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT : THE SUREST WAY TO ITS SUCCESS.—II.

THE general purpose of this movement and its threefold division have been set before the readers of the I. E. RECORD in our last essay. The former consists in the promotion of God’s glory and of our people’s salvation by effective efforts to suppress the prevailing vice of intemperance ; the latter implies—(a) the rescue of present victims ; (b) the prevention of others from becoming victims ; and (c) the reformation of popular opinions and customs, so far as they

create and maintain many fatal temptations against the fourth cardinal virtue. Besides, it has been explained and, in some manner, vindicated that our surest means for succeeding just now in the first of these essential parts of reform is nothing short of the formation, as widespread as may be, of total abstinence associations, based on religion, and enlisting all classes, especially such as are conspicuous for their edification. In the present paper we hope to show the necessity of this same means regarding the second essential—*the preservation of those who are in danger, more or less remote, and above all of the young.*

THE PRESERVATION OF CHILDREN AND OTHERS.

Our assertion that the preservation of children and of others happily free from even temptations to intemperance is an indispensable part of the work in hand, will not be questioned. Withal we do not always find a proper appreciation of the special motives and peculiar circumstances of the case. Some appear to trifle with it; some raise objections; some place limitations which do not quite stand to reason; and some warn all concerned as persons without prudence. Now the preservation of the rising generations from intemperance, as from all other vices, is so important both to our children and to society, that for this reason alone its place among the objects of our temperance movement is the very first place. Their time to come is longest. They are to be the parents of another generation. They will take our own place and hold power over all human interests in a short time. If intemperate, they had better never to have been born. The evils we deplore would be perpetuated. But if saved from the dangers now surrounding them, and also inspired with an heroic enthusiasm or that holy zeal recommended by the Synod of Maynooth against intemperance and all that leads to it, it may be hoped that Ireland will see the day when drunkenness shall have become rare, and when intoxicating drinks will be “used with caution.” Indeed this happy result is certain to be realized to admiration, if our young people be led in the way of total abstinence. Thus we have two reasons of paramount cogency for our

present proposal—advantage and necessity on the children's part, and the same on the part of society. Let us have the children secure from intemperance, and success is secure. They of whom we have had to write such sad things—the present victims—will either be converted, and, having become exemplary will powerfully, *if prudently*, aid our cause; otherwise—and this is sadder still—they shall have speedily finished their course, “not seeing half their days.”

Moreover, total abstinence stands in its most hopeful light when professed by children and by youths in general. The difficulties, often disheartening, experienced in inducing adults to become total abstainers is not found here. The children are willing, even eager, to pledge themselves, and thus purchase at the easiest price a genuine treasure of virtue and happiness. There are difficulties concerning the stability of the child's resolution and the maintenance of a temperance association for youth, about which we shall submit our views further down; but these difficulties are non-intrinsic and may be coped with successfully; so that, in addition to advantage and necessity, peculiar facility and richness of hope may be claimed as arguments in favour of the children's total abstinence association.

WHO ARE INCLUDED ?

The terms “children” and “youth” mean, as we use them, all who have not attained the age of manhood or womanhood. Of course all classes are included; and both sexes. But there is special and obvious necessity for extending our consideration beyond the children of our primary and intermediate schools—practically a million. The advanced students of every profession, and of every department of art and science—above all our ecclesiastical students—must be enlisted; and, though last not least, our young men and women apprenticed to business or trade. This scope is most comprehensive, but not excessive. To all the enumerated, our arguments fully extend; for all, the rule that prevention is better than cure holds good; and regarding all, we think that the very difficulties which are to be met in this part of our work show its urgent necessity. Special

attention may be called to the importance of imbuing our candidates for the sacred ministry with "a perfect spirit" and of training them in similarly perfect practice regarding intoxicating drinks: The Statutes of the Synod of Maynooth ordain as follows:—

"Saepissime etiam exhortandi sunt, praesertim autem hisce temporibus, quando intemperantiae vitium tam grassatur, ut mortificationem Jesu semper in corporibus suis circumferentes, in omnibus temperantiae et modestiae studeant, et in omnibus Christi bonus odor fiant,"¹

And we are assured by those prelates who have been able to apply the test of fair trial, that the combined preaching and practice of total abstinence enables a priest to multiply twenty-fold the fruits of his mission among the Irish people, whether at home or abroad. This consideration is respectfully submitted to the superiors and students of our Irish seminaries.

WHAT PLEDGE.

The next point is, what pledge should be administered to our children and young friends in their present circumstances? In our humble and simple opinion any other pledge than that of total abstinence should prove a curse to those little ones who run and cling to us for a blessing or a smile, or to those young men and women about to take a place by our side and to share our dangers and responsibilities. To them a partial pledge should be, if not "a mockery," certainly "a delusion and a snare;" and to such a proposal, if it could be entertained, might be applied the words of our divine Lord: "What man is there among you, of whom if his son shall ask bread, will he reach him a stone? or if he shall ask a fish, will he reach him a serpent?" (Matt. vii. 9, 10). Yes, there are among us parents and others who exhibit conduct which our Lord supposed to be incompatible with good nature and common sense: "They know not how to give good gifts to their children." (Matt. vii. 11). The readers will be pleased to have the results of making children and young persons

¹ *Acta et Decreta Synodi Maynutianae*, A.D. 1875, No. 321.

accustomed to the use of strong drink set before them by one who is most capable of doing so with full effect. Accordingly we beg to transcribe some sentences from a sermon delivered by Cardinal Manning to a youthful congregation of his own flock. His eminence said ;—

“ When I see a congregation of little children together, I always think there is nothing more beautiful. Even the stars in the firmament are not so beautiful in the sight of God as the souls of little innocent children. And then I say to myself: In a few years these little children who are now ten or twelve years old will be sixteen, or eighteen, or twenty. What will they be then? . . . Shall I tell you what we can see—what we do see, I am sorry to say, too often? We find that boys who were good boys at school . . . when they leave school get out of our sight, and we do not see them again for years. And girls who were humble, modest, obedient, loving, when they were at school . . . when they leave school are also lost to us; we lose sight of them; and what becomes of them? Oh, I can tell you this, that many a poor boy grows up to be a man, and comes back to us in a miserable plight. He has been doing wrong, he has got into a habit of drinking, and that habit has been his ruin. And many a poor girl who was so innocent at school comes back to us after years spent away from her church, wrecked and ruined; and through what? I believe in nineteen cases out of twenty, drink is at the bottom of it.

“ Is it not our duty, therefore, to do all we can to keep you in the innocence of your baptism and in the brightness of your will, as God made it? So long as boy or girl, man or woman, is sober and temperate, having the knowledge of the holy faith . . . he or she will be steadfast against temptation, and persevere in the right way; but the moment in which intoxicating drink darkens the reason, blinds the conscience, and sets the heart and passions on fire, and makes the will weak, there is no sin that may not be committed, no commandment of God that may not be broken, no depth of degradation into which one may not fall. And, therefore, dear children, as God loves you, and as we love you—and we love you for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shed His precious blood for you, and we love you as the lambs of the flock committed to our care—our great desire is to keep you in your innocence, and train you up so that you may never know the temptations; for if you never know the taste of intoxicating drink, you will never be tempted; and you will, I believe, persevere in the innocence of your baptism and in the love of God.

“ There are some fathers who are so careless, and some mothers who are so foolish, that they wont allow their children to be enrolled in the League of the Cross. Nay, they go further

than that. They send their children to the public-house . . . and the poor little boy, or poor little girl, will go to the public-house, and hear the curses and swearing, and the horrible bad language, and see the drunken people ; and so from their earliest childhood become familiar with all that can corrupt and darken, and debase and degrade their heart and will. How is it possible that fathers and mothers can do what I call such a murderous thing as to put their little ones in the danger of such a horrible temptation—because I can tell you that many a drunkard began when he was a boy, going to a public-house to fetch drink for his parents. He was ‘treated,’ as they say ; that is, some wicked man or woman made the poor little boy taste the intoxicating drink, and after a while he began to like it. And many a poor girl learned the taste in the same way, and that was the beginning of her ruin.”

Now, all that Cardinal Manning addressed to children of a particular class and station in London, holds “*mutatis mutandis*” regarding all classes in Ireland. This is manifest in the experience of all. We shall, however, cite one of the many authoritative witnesses in order to impress all concerned with a due sense of this evil. The late Bishop of Ferns, Dr. Warren, in a pastoral, dated October 15th, 1879, wrote :—

“We warn parents and employers, that they are bound to set in their own persons an example of temperance to those who are subject to them, and to watch lest, through their negligence, those entrusted to their charge should fall victims to drink. ‘Train up a young man,’ says Solomon, ‘in the way in which he should walk, and when he is old he will not depart from it.’ (Prov xxii.) If, contrary to this advice, our young children are brought up in the way in which they should not walk—if they are taught to like and to love strong drinks in their infancy and in their youth, they will follow this practice in their after life, and thus acquire a habit, which to many of them will prove their inevitable ruin.

“Some months ago a respectably-dressed boy came and asked to be allowed to take the pledge against using intoxicating drinks. Though a mere boy he was a confirmed drunkard, and bore on his youthful features the repulsive characteristics of the victims of drink. He volunteered to say :—‘I don’t wish to take the pledge for a long time ;’ and giving his reason for not wishing to do so, he said—‘I was always accustomed to drink from the time I was a child, and I am afraid I would not be able to give it up for a long time.’

“Who, we may inquire, was the first to give drink to this

unhappy boy, when he was a mere child, and afterwards to continue to do so in the years that followed childhood? Doubtless, one who was near and dear to him, but who lived long enough to see and feel the effects of such parental folly. And alas! how many mothers do we find who act in this manner, who accustom their children to the use of strong drinks from their tenderest years, and who under various pretexts make these drinks sweet and agreeable to them, without thinking what bitter experience has taught us must be the fearful consequences, a few years later on in life, to many of them.

“How very differently, does history tell us, the pagan mothers of Sparta acted towards their children! They wished, from merely human and patriotic motives, to bring up their children with a horror of drunkenness. And how did they proceed? They first made their slaves drunk with wine; and then, when maddened and rendered foolish with drink, they brought them into the presence of their children, believing thereby to inspire them with a loathing of the vice of drunkenness and of the ways that lead to it. Oh, that many Christian mothers would endeavour to inspire a like horror of ‘this way of ruin’ in the souls of their children, whom God has given them to bring up and to educate for the kingdom of heaven!”

Our quotations are indeed lengthy, but not too long. We are omitting other weighty and conclusive testimonies; and trust that the respected readers of the *I. E. RECORD* will accept with full and earnest conviction our propositions:—
(a) That the proper pledge for children and youth is that of total abstinence; (b) that they should, if possible, be kept from knowing the taste of intoxicating drink; and (c) that a horror of intemperance, with a dread of every avenue leading to it, should be impressed upon them, with all the earnestness of prudent zeal, from the earliest years. If so, blessed results are ensured—results “desirable beyond silver and gold”—results, thank God, already foreseen and described by some of our present pastors, as in the following passage of the *Leinster Provincial Pastoral* for last Passion Sunday (pages 20, 21):—

“Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the possibility of forming for adults an organization, at once widespread and durable, on the basis of total abstinence alone, there is, we gladly observe, practically no difference of opinion as to the course to be taken in the case of children. For children, at all events, the advantage of total abstinence, and the possibility of

securing its general observance, are unquestioned. In their case, save in some exceptional instances, no need is even supposed to exist which should hinder their being brought up without knowing the taste of intoxicating drink. If they are brought up without knowing the taste of it, they will know no longing for it, and there will be no grave temptation to them to abandon the principles of total abstinence in after life.

“From year to year many thousands of them will reach the age of maturity, and will pass, as a matter of course, into the ranks of the total abstainers, adding largely, year after year, to the number of grown-up men and women by whom the virtue of temperance is practised in its most exemplary form. Especially in one respect, all this will tend to the better observance of temperance, and so to the salvation of souls. For with every such increase in the number of those who practice total abstinence, many of the sources of temptation that now prove fatal to the good resolutions of so many of our people will, one by one, disappear. Temptations arising from the evil influence of others will become less frequent, and far easier to overcome. The influence of good example will be strengthened. A sound public opinion on the subject of intemperance will speedily be formed; and this, with God’s blessing, will prove to be, in His hand, one of the chief instruments in the working out of a lasting temperance reform.”

DO YOUNG CHILDREN UNDERSTAND THE PLEDGE?

Taking now the objections and difficulties connected with our question, it had better be shown, in the first place, that even very young children understand the nature of the renunciation implied by a total abstinence pledge. Everyone knows that all children are very premature in appreciating the things which gratify the taste, and are captivated or fascinated, far more than grown people, by all that is “good to eat, and fair to the eyes, and delightful to behold.” They know well what they give up by the pledge, and if they do it so eagerly, it is because they feel that it is no loss to natural pleasure and well-being; and they are right. “Sometimes,” said Cardinal Manning, in the address upon which we have already drawn so freely, “I am told children do not understand what the pledge is, and I always answer, ‘Children understand what the pledge is better than you do.’” Hence we should respectfully beg to give our vote against any limitations in the children’s pledge. There is no deception involved in this pledge. If it be a blessing, why curtail its

tenure, as a matter of course, and thereby even provoke its anticipated forfeiture? For, the placing of a term begets a more painful sense of restriction, and a pledge till twenty-one years, considering the present popular esteem and love of drink, acts pretty much like a partial pledge, in whetting and even creating natural desires and passion. This, we know, is against the general practice at home. It is held that after twenty-one—or any other term—there is little or no danger. Well, we submit that the prevailing or general views regarding our relations with intoxicating drink, if judged by their fruits, cannot be pronounced satisfactory; and experience teaches that many who grew up as total abstainers, and who took no strong drink till long-settled in life, afterwards became most pitiable victims. Of course they were saved from personal temptation till they began to drink; but when some exterior temptation led them “to indulge moderately,” the drink itself did the rest. The safest and simplest pledge, for children and youth, appears to us to be *total abstinence, without limit of time, and understood to allow no kind or quantity of intoxicating drink, except when really needed as medicine.* This pledge is thoroughly understood, it is absolutely beneficial, and it alone will securely save. A pledge till twenty-one, and then renewable or to be renewed, is not so easy, not so safe, not so efficacious, and not so meritorious as one for life, and all at once.

WILL CHILDREN AND YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN TAKE THIS
PLEDGE?

Our children—those who are young, and all boys and girls still at school—will take the total abstinence pledge *without limit of time* so readily and so eagerly from the bishop or from a priest, that people who love drink say: “They don’t know what they are asked to do.” A recent American newspaper, recounting proceedings connected with the Centenary of Father Mathew, reports that a certain archbishop—a gifted son of Ireland—said in the course of his speech:—

“Fifty years ago Father Mathew came to his native town, and after serving mass, Father Mathew asked him to accompany

him. 'I did so [said the archbishop], and he went from place to place administering the pledge; and every time he administered it, I took the pledge.'"

A priest who has had considerable experience as a conductor of retreats in our higher schools — colleges and convents — has ever found two facts which surprise some when told. First, that the total abstinence pledge, proposed on the grounds of prudence, edification, and devotion, has a strong attraction for many even amongst the grown children; secondly, that there is always a decided majority in favour of the pledge without limit of time, or, as the phrase has it, "for life." For example, at a retreat in a certain diocesan college which had a total of one hundred and eleven Catholic students, ninety-four took the pledge for life, and eleven till the age of twenty-one. It is true that there has been a total abstinence association maintained among the students over ten years; that the present, as the former, president leads; and that there has been a strong spirit aroused throughout the diocese against the snares of intemperance by the action of both bishops and clergy: but there was no undue pressure employed, no mere enthusiasm excited; parents were consulted, and the boys themselves were called on to come forward and to inscribe their respective names upon the register.

WILL SUCH PLEDGES BE KEPT?

Too much may easily be made of the above and similar facts. The blossom is not the fruit; and trees once laden with blossom may be found bearing but little fruit. Thus the grand results forecasted in the quotation from the pastoral of our Leinster prelates depend upon the protection, vigilance and edification which parents and all concerned afford to children and young persons who have taken the pledge.

A little girl, a few years ago, took the pledge from the bishop, together with her school companions. In due time she remarked that "a black bottle" was kept locked up by the mother; and she felt tempted to taste what might be in it. An opportunity came; the contents tasted; the pledge,

as the child thought, broken. A companion child was entrusted with the secret ; but the secret passed to the nun in charge, and Mary was asked by her mistress before all in the school : “ Mary, have you broken the pledge ? ” Then poor little Mary, crying, sobbed out :—“ Oh, please ma’am, I only took one little sup out of mamma’s black bottle.”

On the contrary, we know a person, and more than one, who took the pledge even at four years of age, and who, through the care and encouragement of a wise mother, has never tasted certain strong drinks, and has not the least desire to do so.

These are typical cases regarding young children. Very much the same is true of our young men and women. The latter, in a particular way, will dislike strong drink, if only fashion be set against its use ; and will regard it as a duty of their station to belong to an association formed not merely for the reclamation of drunkards, but chiefly for the edification of children, and for self-preservation. But if fashion leads to drink, they will not be unfashionable, and must in many cases become intemperate. Young men have stronger temptations, and must often stand where it is difficult not to fall. They are self-trusting, imprudent, and wilful. The wise man declares that the way of a young man is a mystery. Should his companions frequent bars, and delight in frequent glasses, he will be one with them, and will bring on swift destruction. But should he in good time become associated with others young as himself and yet filled with zeal against the ways of ruin, successful at business, valued by employers, sought for by friends, and spending their recreation hour in safety, his future will be one of progressive prosperity. Before us lies a speech delivered in Dublin, by the Rev. Dr. Conatty, President of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, A.D. 1889, containing some passages which support this view with great effect. We have to omit all but the following :—

“ I solemnly assure you, the greatest difficulty and trouble we American priests have is given us by the young Irish greenhorns who drift into the liquor saloons on their arrival, and thus pave the way for afterwards becoming easy victims to the giant evil of intemperance.”

Just before, he had given the following advice to emigrants :—

“Take my advice, and, before you step on board the vessel for America, arm yourselves for the struggle by placing yourselves under the protection of the total abstinence pledge.”

For our young men, then, total abstinence is above all things necessary; and though it be, we cannot practically think of holding them to its observance without the example and influence of many others who have no such necessity; without religious organization and adequate counter-attractions to the haunts and snares of intemperance. This of the laity; but of the seminarists—our best hope—what answer may be given to the query: “Will they keep their pledge?” The answer is an affirmative. Nowadays the more adverse conditions of society are, happily, altered. The advice of physician or of friend is no longer against keeping the pledge; the fatal pressure of society at table and on other occasions has ceased; the rebuke of elders is no longer heard. Consequently the student in passing from the initial to the final stages of his course, allowed just occasional contact with the world abroad, will find his resolution increased in manly depth. Then, ordained and imbued with apostolic fortitude and zeal, he begins, as our Lord, “to do and to teach,” and inherits the mission of the apostle of temperance—Theobald Mathew. So, thank God, the best work for our needed reform can be carried on where the Church has full fair play—in the very nurseries of her priesthood. Maynooth, All Hallows, with other seminaries at home and far away, will year by year send forth priests to preach and practise that which is, as we have shown, our only hope of saving the rising generations from the snares and ruin of intemperance.

OUR ARGUMENT.

Summing up, then, on this point, we venture to claim that the practice of total abstinence is, *at present*, necessary to the youth of Ireland as a means of preserving the virtue of temperance; and that the organization of all classes in religious associations for the purpose of upholding and

propagating total abstinence is necessary for the perseverance and preservation of the youthful members of their own families and of society at large. Ample confirmation of this conclusion is at hand; suffice it, however, to adduce once more the words of the Vicar of Christ:—

“Hence we esteem worthy of all commendation the noble resolve of your pious associations, by which they pledge themselves to abstain from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it at all be doubted that this determination is a proper and truly efficacious remedy for this very great evil, and that so much the more strongly will all be induced to put this bridle upon appetite, by how much the greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example.”

The question, How can this be made sufficiently general? now arises; but it must be again postponed till the means for the third essential part of our reform shall have been considered.

MICHAEL KELLY, M.S.S.

Liturgical Questions.

I.

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PRAYERS TO BE SAID AFTER MASS.

“Your reply¹ to “P.P.,” on the subject of the papal prayers after mass, encourages X. Y. to ask a few questions on the same subject.

“1. What is the meaning of the word ‘ecclesiis’ in the rubric prefixed to the text of the ‘prayers’? This rubric, according to the I. E. RECORD of the year 1886, page 1050, is as follows:—‘Preces jussu Papae Leonis XIII. in omnibus orbis ecclesiis post privatae Missae celebrationem flexis genibus recitandae.’ Does the word ‘ecclesiis’ in this place admit of such wide interpretation as to include private oratories, and even private houses, where a priest may happen to celebrate

¹ See I. E. RECORD vol. xi., Nov. 1890, page 1043.

mass? Mass may be said on board ship at sea, or under the open sky. Are the prayers to be said in such circumstances?

"2. On Christmas Day, when a priest says three masses in immediate succession, not having left the altar from the beginning of the first mass until the end of the third, is he to say the 'prayers,' in question, after each of the three masses, or only after the last? The usage of saying the *De Profundis* after the last only, is scarcely parallel, since, not knowing the origin of the custom, we may fairly suppose it is in accordance with the original rescript or indult. In the case of the 'prayers,' there is nothing to indicate that the first and second masses do not fall under the papal law.

"3. If a priest is under the necessity of administering Holy Communion immediately after mass before he leaves the altar, ought he first to say the *De Profundis* and the 'prayers,' and then distribute the Holy Communion; or is he to say the 'prayers' only, leaving the *De Profundis* until after the Holy Communion has been administered? The reason for doubting is a reply of the Sacred Congregation of Rites to the following effect:—'*Preces a SS. Domino nostro Papa Leone XIII. præsriptae recitandae sunt immediate expleto ultimo Evangelio,*' 23 Nov., 1887. "X. Y."

1. Whatever may be the signification of the word *ecclesiis* in the rubric referred to by our correspondent, there can be no doubt about the meaning of the rubric itself. The rubric does not mean, as is insinuated in the question, that the prayers ordered by the Pope to be said after low masses, are to be said only in churches, properly so-called, to the exclusion of oratories and all other places in which it is lawful to say mass. It means that these prayers are to be said after every low mass, no matter where celebrated.

This interpretation of the rubric is founded—first, on the universal practice, which, after the legislator himself, is the safest and best guide to follow. There is no doubt the universal practice is to recite these prayers after every low mass, whether celebrated on land or on sea, whether in a cathedral or a peasant's cottage. Secondly, this interpretation has been, at least tacitly, approved of by the Congregation of Rites. For in a question proposed to this Congregation these prayers are thus referred to:—*An preces*

post finem cujusque missae sine cantu celebratae, etc.? These words clearly imply that the prayers are to be said after every low mass. There is here no restricting word like the word *ecclesiis*, which has excited our correspondent's doubts. Now had it been the intention of the Holy Father, and consequently the meaning of the rubric, that the recital of these prayers should be confined to churches, the Congregation, in replying to this question, should have pointed out to the *orator* that his interpretation of the rubric was incorrect. The Congregation, however, did no such thing. The question is replied to without note or comment.

Thirdly, in the French translation of a recent work on Indulgences, written in Rome, by Father Beringer, S.J., the section on these prayers is headed, *Prières à dire à genoux à la fin de chaque messe basse*.

Finally, this same phrase, *in fine cujusque missae sine cantu celebratae*, occurs in the official document by which his Holiness first prescribed the recital of prayers after mass. The rubric to which our correspondent calls attention was merely prefixed to these prayers when published in their present form in 1886. It is true that in the former as well as in the latter document the word *ecclesiis* occurs—in *omnibus tum Urbis tum Catholici orbis Ecclesiis* is the context in the older. But from what has been said it is clear that the phrase, *in fine cujusque missae*, is by no means restricted by this word. What occurs to us as the most probable explanation of the use of the word is that the whole phrase is merely a circumlocutory form for *in Universa Ecclesia*; and, consequently, that it does not refer at all to the material building. The word generally used for "church" in this latter sense is *templum*, not *ecclesia*. Thus, in the documents regarding the October devotions, we have such phrases as *in curialibus templis*; *in aliis templis*; *in omnibus Catholici orbis parochialibus templis*, &c.

2. When a priest says three masses consecutively on Christmas Day he is to say the prayers after the last only. No doubt the letter of the rubric seems to exclude this

opinion, which, nevertheless, we conceive to be in strict accordance with the spirit of it. The custom prevailing in Ireland regarding the recital of the *De Profundis*, is not, we admit, a sufficient reason for treating these prayers similarly; but would it not appear that the same feeling which begot the custom of reciting the former only after the last of the three masses, is quite justified in begetting a similar custom with regard to the latter also? The following answer to this same question is taken from the *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, which, though not an official publication, is of the very highest authority on liturgical matters:—

“*Quaer.* Preces post missam praescriptae dicendae ne sunt in die Nativitatis Domini post unamquamque, vel post ultimam tantum?

“*Resp.* Negative ad primum, ad alterum affirmative. Ratio est quia licet unaquaeque ex tribus missis completum actum de se constituat ut hac de causa post singulas dicendae illae preces videantur, nihilominus hi tres singuli actus antonomastice liturgici ita sunt peragendi ut nullus alius actus in Missali haud praescriptus inter illos immiscendus sit. Adde preces de quibus in casu ad missam non pertinere neque stricte liturgicas posse dici, sed potius extra-liturgicas, ut infra unam et alteram missam eae recitari non debeant. Lex enim est ut post primam statim dicatur altera, si decenda sit; et post alteram tertia missa; preces vero dictae partim missae, nulla ratione constituunt.”¹

3. Had our correspondent taken the trouble to read the question to which the reply he quotes was given by the Congregation of Rites, he would not have the least foundation for the doubt he proposes for solution. For his greater convenience, as well as for the benefit of others, we subjoin the question and answer in full:—

“*Quaer.* Utrum preces praescriptas in quibusdam casibus, nempe vel alicujus parvae functionis vel communionis distri-

¹ Since writing the above, our correspondent X.Y. has kindly sent us the following questions proposed to the Congregation of Rites, with the replies given by the Congregation:—

“Num in die festo Nativitatis D.N.J.C. a sacerdote tres missas celebrante preces istae etiam tunc, quando post primam aut secundam missam *non discedit* ab altari, post unamquamque missam peragendae sint?

“An vero sufficiat, si duntaxat peragantur quoties ab altari disceditur, sive discessio post primam missam, sive post secundam, aut demum post tertiam fiat?

“*Negative* ad primam partem: *affirmative* ad secundam (die 30 Ap. 1889).”

buendae, peracta demum adnexa missae caeremonia recitare liceat, vel an subsequi missam ipsae semper immediate debeant?

“*Resp.* Preces a SSmo. D. N. Leone Papa XIII.,¹ prae-scriptae, recitandae sunt immediate expleto ultimo Evangelio.”¹

As in Ireland the *De Profundis* is said immediately after the last Gospel, and the prayers only after the *De Profundis*, it follows that Communion is not to be given, nor any other ceremony to be performed, until both the psalm and the prayers have been recited.

II.

THE VOTIVE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

“Kindly allow me to add one other question, although on a different subject. By a decree of the 20th March, 1706, the Irish clergy were authorized to recite the Votive Office of the Most Holy Sacrament every Thursday, not impeded by a feast of nine lessons, except during the Advent and Lent, on vigils, and on certain *ferias*. This office is given in the proper at the end of the Maynooth Breviary. The Sacred Congregation of Rites declared that by the recent grant of Votive Offices nothing was changed in the former grants. It appears, therefore, to follow that the Office of the Most Holy Sacrament, which during the year the Irish clergy are privileged to say, is that prescribed by the decree of March, 1706; whilst that which during Advent or Lent, or on certain vigils, the *Ordo* refers to, is the office in accordance with the recent grant. The two offices are not identical. May I ask, consequently, if it would not be well to have some indication in the *Ordo* which would help to prevent any mistake as to the correct office?”

“X. Y.”

Our correspondent has mistaken the import of the decree of March 20th, 1706. In the first place it was a general decree, and not, as he implies, a decree special to Ireland. Secondly, it did not authorize the Irish clergy, or the clergy of any other nation, to recite the Votive Office of the Most Holy Sacrament on Thursdays, or on any other day of the week. Lastly, it did not approve of any particular form of Votive Office whatsoever. It did, however, declare that the indult granting to certain nations, religions, and churches,

¹ *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. xxiii., page 128.

the privilege of reciting the Votive Office of the Most Holy Sacrament on Thursdays not already occupied by a feast of nine lessons either occurring or transferred, did not extend to the Thursdays of Advent or Lent. Hence the Office of the Most Holy Sacrament given at the end of the "Maynooth" (?) breviary—and, we may add, in the Irish supplement of breviaries printed in Tours and other places on the continent for many years—was not approved of by the decree cited by our correspondent; nor, as far as we can learn, by any previous or subsequent decrees of the Congregation of Rites.

The office referred to differs from the ordinary Votive of the Most Holy Sacrament only in the lessons of the second and third nocturns. In the ordinary office these are taken from the several days within the octave of Corpus Christi, and vary from month to month, while in what we may for the present call the Irish Office, these lessons are always taken from the Office of the Feast of Corpus Christi itself, and are consequently invariable. Herein lies the entire difference. Now, as the Irish Office differed only in this particular from the office granted to other countries from the beginning, there is a *prima facie* reason for doubting whether this form of the office was ever approved of. This doubt is strengthened by the absence of all documentary evidence; and, indeed, taking all the circumstances into consideration, we have no hesitation in saying that it is morally certain the Irish form of this Votive Office never had the requisite approval. But as the difference is so immaterial, and the number of times it could be recited each year so small, the violation of the liturgical laws was of the most venial kind.

But granting for a moment that this form of the office had been approved, the general privilege recently extended to the whole Church of reciting the more usual form of this office would surely apply to Irish priests; and, consequently, that they could, not only during Advent and Lent, but also at all other times, recite the new office. The declaration that this recent grant of Votive Offices did not interfere with former grants, would seem to refer rather to the matter or object of the offices than to their form.

At all events, the Irish priests not only may avail themselves of the new privilege, and read the Votive Office of the Most Holy Sacrament given among the others, but we are decidedly of opinion that when they elect to read a Votive Office in honour of this mystery, they are bound to read this one, and no other.

III.

REQUIEM MASS WITHIN THE OCTAVE OF ALL SAINTS.

"Would you kindly say in the next number of the I. E. RECORD, which of the masses *pro defunctis* is a priest to say on a day within the octave of All Saints when he says mass in black vestments? Is it not the *Missa Quotidiana*, with the prayer *Pro omnibus fidelibus defunctis* only, with the *Dies Irae*? Does not that prayer, with the *Dies Irae*, harmonize more with the intentions of the donors than do the preceding prayers in the same mass?

"SACERDOS."

The Requiem mass to be said in the circumstances contemplated by our correspondent is, as he himself suggests, the *Missa Quotidiana*, but with three instead of only one prayer, and with or without the *Dies Irae*, according to the good pleasure of the celebrant. We do not quite understand what our correspondent means by saying that the prayer *Pro omnibus fidelibus defunctis* would harmonize better with the intentions of the donors of *honoraria*. If a donor wished to have mass offered for one soul, or for several specified souls, how would this prayer harmonize with his intention? Besides, even though a priest is celebrating a Requiem mass for the souls in purgatory in general in discharge of an obligation, either during the octave of All Saints, or at any other time, how is he acting more in accordance with the intention of the donor by saying only the prayer *Fidelium*, than by saying it in addition to two others? Moreover, granting for argument's sake our correspondent's contention, will anyone maintain that the rubrics of the missal, the strictest and most sacred body of ecclesiastical laws in existence, are to be changed so as to make them harmonize with the wish or intention of every donor of a *honorarium*? In a private Requiem mass three prayers must always be said, unless on what are known as the privileged days, among

which, however, are not included the octave of All Saints. The *Diès Irae* must be said when only one prayer is said, and may be said in every Requiem mass.

IV.

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE BROWN SCAPULAR.

"The I. E. RECORD for this month (October, 1890) states, on page 944, that the Instruction of Propaganda, of June, 1889, to bishops in missionary countries under its charge, declares those bishops to be still possessed of the same ample faculties 'in all their plenitude' which were granted them before July 16, 1887, in reference to the confraternities of the Holy Trinity, Mount Carmel, and the Seven Dolors, notwithstanding the decree issued on the date last mentioned.

"Please state in your next, or following number, if this means—(1) that priests in those missionary countries you describe are not obliged to take and transmit to a Carmelite convent the names of persons invested by them in the scapular of Mount Carmel for inscription in the register. Can we *validly enrol* persons as we used to do previous to July 16, 1889, without taking their names? (2) Are we obliged to use the new formula for investing in the 'Brown Scapular' under pain of nullity?

"I suppose the priests to have had faculties for investing from the bishop before July 16, 1887, and to have received no instructions from him on the matter since. "J. J. W."

We beg to refer our correspondent to the September number of the I. E. RECORD¹ for all the necessary information regarding the Brown Scapular. We may, however, here repeat that the names *must be enrolled*; the register in which the names are entered must be the register of a duly established confraternity, or—what is equivalent—must be kept in a Carmelite convent.

V.

MAY THE CHOIR SING DURING THE CONSECRATION?

"At the parochial mass on Sundays it is in many places customary for the choir to continue singing during the solemn moments of the consecration. Kindly say what you think of this custom. Should it be tolerated, or abolished? "INQUIRER."

What we think about this custom can be stated in a very

¹ Page 845, *et seq.*

few words. We are decidedly of opinion that it should be abolished—quietly, of course, and prudently; but, nevertheless, effectually. Such a custom would seem to be founded on complete forgetfulness of the tremendous mysteries which fill up the moments of consecration. Reverence for these mysteries demands not only interior adoration and worship, but also the exterior manifestation of these inward feelings. And though vocal music can be made to express feelings of joy and sorrow, or to embody acts of love and praise, yet its language fails to convey the sentiments which fill the hearts of the pious, while, in their very presence, bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. But it is not on the intrinsic inappropriateness of singing during the consecration that we rely for proof that it should be forbidden. It is a cause of distraction, and is calculated to weaken the reverence of the people for the Blessed Sacrament. The singers themselves must necessarily be distracted. It is difficult, if not impossible, for them to combine attention to the conductor's wand and the music sheet with due attention to the sublime mysteries of the consecration. They sing to give glory to God. During the consecration they should remain silent for His glory, and join with the priest and the remainder of the people in mute and heartfelt adoration. And not only are those who sing distracted, but many, if not all, in the church are likewise distracted. This is the case, no matter of what kind the singing is, but especially when it is of that theatrical kind, which is sometimes to be heard in our churches.

These are merely *à priori* reasons, with which, however, we should expect to find the liturgy in harmony. And we are not disappointed. The *Ceremonial* has the following:—¹ “The choir (after the Preface) proceeds with the singing, as far as *Benedictus qui venit*, &c., exclusively. Then the Blessed Sacrament is elevated, AND THE CHOIR REMAINS SILENT, AND ADORES WITH THE REST.”

Liturgical writers are in agreement on this question, as

¹ l. 2, c. 8, n. 70°, “Chorus prosequitur cantum usque ad *Benedictus qui venit*, &c., quo finito et non prius elevatur Sacramentum. Tunc silet chorus et cum aliis adorat.”

indeed they must, by seeing how clear and definite are the words of the *Ceremonial*. Thus Wapelhorst, for example, says without any limitation or exception, that it is not lawful to sing during the Elevation.¹

The choir should, therefore, sing the *Sanctus*, &c., in such a manner as to finish the portion prescribed before the consecration. But whether they have finished or not, they should at once cease when the bell rings to warn the people that the consecration is about to commence. We may remark that the organ may continue to play, provided the music be of a grave and solemn character.²

D. O'LOAN.

Correspondence.

PRIESTS AND POLITICS.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—In the article of the Rev. J. S. Vaughan, under this title, in the January Number of the I. E. RECORD, page 42, there occurred a quotation from certain “regulations,” given in an Appendix to the Diocesan Synods of Shrewsbury, with his (perhaps, I may say) slightly facetious comments on the same. It is, I think, unfortunate, that the writer should have quoted only half the paragraph of the bishop’s regulation, as, taken apart from the preceding words, it is liable to misconstruction. May I present your readers with the entire passage?

““ Since the influence of his high position is given to the priest as a sacred trust, to be exercised for the welfare of his *entire* flock, and the use of such influence for the furthering of his mere private or personal views would be a grave breach of that trust, we prohibit all public action of our clergy, whether on platforms or by writing, in the strife of party politics, unless where a distinctively Catholic question, such as the defence of schools, calls for our united action.””

¹ “Ad elevationem SS. Sacramenti cantare non licet,” n. 98, 5º.

² *Ceremonial*, loc. cit.

The bishop's view on this subject is more fully developed in his Pastoral of September 27th, 1889, in which, summing up the duties of a priest, his Lordship writes (page 380) :—

“ ‘The priest must be, in fine, a leader of the people in all that is Catholic ; sometimes alone in his leadership, sometimes in concert with those of the laity who will help him in his work.

“ ‘True, he is not free, as others, to descend from the height where God has placed him to the level of party quarrels, nor to use the influence of his sacred character, which is the Church's solemn trust for the doing of her work among souls, as a partisan in the strife of opinions where men may differ without sin. He is appointed the healer and not the maker of divisions among his flock. Yet he is, at the same time, the teacher of those principles of the Divine law by which men must be ruled in every circumstance of life ; and these he may and must teach.

“ ‘He must teach that, however righteous the end we strive for, no end can justify a means which the Church condemns. He must be ready, if need be, to forfeit without hesitation the popular favour which is to be earned by softening down or suppressing a Catholic teaching or principle : and it needs some courage to speak the truth out plainly when it is not acceptable to those he addresses. The true priest who works for God and souls will not shrink from this if the need arise. He will remember his Master's words to those who sought the applause of men by pandering to their evil ways :—*Woe to you when men shall bless you : for according to these things did their fathers to the false prophets.*’ ”—Yours faithfully.

WILFRID DALLOW.

Upton Hall, Birkenhead.

APPENDIX TO LEHMKUHL'S "THEOLOGIA MORALIS."

“VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I am thankful to your correspondent for the information given regarding the Appendix to Lehmkühl's Theology. Still it does not meet my case. The edition I have is the third, and I know the book has run to the fifth edition with very many corrections, &c., not found in the third, and which are all more or less important. I have no doubt many priests would be very anxious to procure an appendix containing all these. If such an appendix has not yet been published, may I suggest the advisability

of doing so, either, by way of supplement to the one mentioned by your correspondent, or by an independent one, which would contain all corrections from the first edition up to the fifth and last. And this might prove a complete and final one, as the learned author is not likely, I believe, to issue any further 'amended' edition.

I presume to direct these remarks especially to the publishers, Messrs. Burns & Oates, London, and Herder, Friburgi, Brisgoniæ, in the hope that they will remedy the desired want.

A SUBSCRIBER.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I see from the *Literarischer Handweiser*, that P. Lehmkuhl has published an appendix to his *Theologia Moralis*, containing, in thirty pages, all the changes made from the second to the sixth edition, price forty pfennige; publisher, Herder. As there was question about this in the I. E. RECORD some time ago, I think that this information may be welcome to you.—Yours,

H. BEVERUNGE.

Documents.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS, LEO XIII., COMMENDING DEVOTION TO THE HOLY FAMILY.

DILECTE FILI NOSTER, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Novum argumentum perspecti tui erga hanc Apostolicam Sedem studii et obsequii prodiderunt litterae Augusto mense exeunte ad Nos datae, quibus vota Nobis significasti plurium fidelium, ut veneratio quae Christo Domino ac Matri Virgini et S. Josepho domesticae Ejus societatis consortibus, sub Sacrae Familiae titulo exhibetur, ad ampliorem in Ecclesia cultus dignitatem provehatur, atque de hac re, uti fieri debet in causis gravibus fidem ac disciplinam spectantibus, sententiam et judicium hujus Apostolicae Sedis postulasti. Tuae observantiae et prudentiae officium Nos plurimi aestimantes, confestim postulationis tuae rationem habendam censuimus, ac rem propositam Consilio

Nostro sacris ritibus praeposito cognoscendam mandavimus, ut deinde ad Nos consulta et exquisita referret. Re itaque diligenter expensa, Tibi nunc significamus, ob peculiare justasque causas Nos decrevisse ut pietatis cultus erga Sacram Familiam nullis aliis inductis ejus exercendi novis formis in eo statu servetur, in quo auctoritate hujus Apostolicae Sedis probatus fuit, atque ut potissimum christianae domus Sacram Familiam ad venerationem et exemplum propositum habeant, juxta instituta pia illius Consociationis, quam Decessor Noster fel. rec. Pius IX suis litteris die V Januarii Anno MDCCCLXX datis, probavit et commendavit, atque in spem certam maximorum fructuum latius in dies propagari exoptavit. Quam spem salutarium bonorum et Nos ultro in ejusdem Societatis spiritu ponimus; confidimus enim Fideles omnes probe intelligentes, in cultu quem Sacrae Familiae exhibent, sese mysterium vitae absconditae venerari, quam Christus cum Virgine Matre et S. Josepho egit, inde magnos stimulos habituros ad fidei fervorem augendum, et virtutes imitandas, quae in divino Magistro, ac Deipara Ejusque Sponso sanctissimo fulserunt. Hae autem virtutes, ut non semel monuimus, dum aeternae vitae mercedem pariunt, ad prosperitatem etiam domesticae et civilis societatis tam misere hoc tempore laborantis spectant; cum ex familiis sancte constitutis, civitatis etiam commune bonum, cujus familia fundamentum est, necessario consequatur. Majus vero fiducia Nostra incrementum capit dum cogitamus, Sacrae Familiae cultores ex instituto Societatis quam diximus, a Christo Domino gratiam per merita Matris Virginis et S. Josephi sedulo efflagitantes, propitiam indubie opem experturos, ut vitam sancte componant, atque uti in domibus suis concordiam, caritatem, in adversis tolerantiam morumque honestatem laetentur efflorescere. Vota igitur ad Deum effundimus, ut germanus memoratae Societatis spiritus in dies latius inter Fideles emanet ac vigeat, atque in hanc rem operam suam collaturos tum sacrorum Antistites, tum omnes Ecclesiae administros non dubitamus. In mandatis, autem dedimus Consilio Nostro sacris ritibus praepositio, ut orandi formulam ad te mittat, quam confici et edi curavimus in usum fidelium ad domos suas Sacrae Familiae consecrandas, tum etiam quotidianae precationis exemplar a fidelibus in Sacrae Familiae veneratione persolvendae. Tuo demum in Nos obsequio, Dilecte Fili Noster, parem dilectionis affectum libenter profitemur, et in auspiciis coelestium munerum, Apostolicam Benedictionem

Tibi et Clero ac Fidelibus, quibus praesides, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xx Novembris Anno MDCCCXC, Pontificatus Nostri Decimo tertio.

LEO PAPA XIII.

FORM TO BE SAID BY CHRISTIAN FAMILIES WHO CONSECRATE
THEMSELVES TO THE HOLY FAMILY.

FORMULA RECITANDA A CHRISTIANIS FAMILIIS QUAE SE SACRAE
FAMILIAE CONSECRANT.

O Jesu Redemptor noster amabilissime, qui e coelo missus ut mundum doctrina et exemplo illustrares, majorem mortalis tuae vitae partem in humili domo Nazarena traducere voluisti, Mariae et Josepho subditus illamque Familiam consecrasti, quae cunctis christianis familiis futura erat exemplo, nostram hanc domum, quae Tibi se totam nunc devovet, benignus suscipe. Tu illam protege et custodi, et sanctum tui timorem in ea confirma, una cum pace et concordia christianae caritatis; ut divino exemplari Familiae tuae similis fiat, omnesque ad unum quibus ea constat, beatitudinis sempiternae sint compotes.

O amantissima Jesu Christi Mater et mater nostra Maria, tua pietate et clementia fac ut consecrationem hanc nostram Jesus acceptam habeat et sua nobis beneficia et benedictiones largiatur.

O Joseph, sanctissime Jesu et Mariae custos, in universis animae et corporis necessitatibus nobis tuis precibus succurre; ut tecum una et beata Virgine Mariae aeternas divino Redemptori Jesu Christo laudes et gratias rependere possimus.

INDULGENCED PRAYER TO BE SAID DAILY BEFORE A PICTURE
OF THE HOLY FAMILY.

ORATIO QUOTIDIE RECITANDA ANTE IMAGINEM SACRAE FAMILIAE.

O amantissime Jesu, qui ineffabilibus tuis virtutibus et vitae domesticae exemplis familiam a te electam in terris consecrasti, clementer aspice nostram hanc domum, quae ad tuos, pedes provoluta propitium te sibi deprecatur. Memento tuam esse hanc domum; quoniam tibi se peculiari cultu sacravit ac devovit. Ipsam benignus tuere, a periculis eripe, ipsi in necessitatibus

occurre, et virtutem largire, qua in imitatione Familiae tuae sanctae jugiter perseveret; ut mortalis suae vitae tempore in Tui ebsequio et amore fideliter inhaerens, valeat tandem aeternas tibi laudes persolvere in coelis.

O Maria Mater dulcissima, tuum praesidium imploramus, certi divinum tuum Unigenitum precibus tuis obsecuturum.

Tuque etiam, gloriosissime, Patriarcha sancte Joseph, potenti tuo patrocinio nobis succurre et Mariae manibus vota nostra Jesu Christo porrigenda submitte.

Indulgentia 300 dierum semel in die lucranda ab iis qui se Sacrae Familiae dedicant juxta formulam a S. Rituum Congregatione editam.

LEO PP. XIII.

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, teach us, help us, save us. Amen.

Indulgentia 200 dierum semel in die lucranda.

LEO PP. XIII.

DECISIONS OF ROMAN CONGREGATION—ERECTION OF THE STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

SUMMARY.

1. The application for such faculty need not be in writing.
2. The faculty granted by the bishop to erect the Stations of the Cross is invalid unless given in writing.
3. That the written faculty should declare the fact that the bishop who grants it has himself received powers to erect Stations, is to be recommended, though not necessary.
4. Documentary evidence of the erection ought to be kept either amongst the *acta* of the bishop, or in the mission archives; but this is not essential for the validity of the erection.

EX S. CONGR. INDULGENTIARUM.

Dubia de Necessariis

ad

Validam Erectionem Stationum Viae Crucis.

Episcopus Constantiensis et Abrincensis, provinciae Rothomagensis in Gallia, huic Sacrae Indulgentiarum Congregationi humiliter exponit:

Quum in una Apamiensi die 25 Septembris, 1841 (*Decret. Authent. S. C. Indulgentiarum, Edit. Ratisb. n. 294*) legatur dis-

positio sequentis tenoris: "Circa erectionem Stationum Viae Crucis, impetratis antea ab Apostolica Sede necessariis et opportunis facultatibus, omnia et singula, quae talem erectionem respiciunt, scripto fiant, tam nempe postulatio quàm ejusdem erectionis concessio, quarum instrumentum in codicibus seu in actis Episcopatus remaneat, et testimonium saltem in codicibus paroeciae seu loci, ubi fuerint erectae praefatae Stationes, inseratur;" hinc quaeritur:

I. An postulatio erectionis scripto fieri debeat sub poena nullitatis?

II. An ipsa concessio Episcopi, qui ab Apostolica Sede facultatem obtinuit erigendi Stationes Viae Crucis, item scripto fieri debeat sub poena nullitatis?

III. An in ipsa Episcopi concessione mentio fieri debeat facultatis obtentae ab ipsa Apostolica Sede erigendi Stationes Viae Crucis, sub poena nullitatis?

IV. An tandem testimonium erectionis in actis Episcopatus aut in codicibus paroeciae seu loci in quo fit erectio Stationum Viae Crucis, inserendum sit sub eadem nullitatis poena?

Porro Sacra Congregatio propositis quaesitis ita respondendum censuit:

Ad. I. *Negative.*

Ad. II. *Affirmative.*

Ad. III. *Congruit ut fiat mentio, sed non est necessaria.*

Ad. IV. *Praescribitur insertio testimonii erectionis in actis Episcopalibus et in codicibus paroeciae seu loci, etc., sed non sub poena nullitatis.*

Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 6 Augusti, 1890.

S. Cong. Indulg., 6 Aug., 1890.

Notices of Books.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS PER MODUM CONFERENTIARUM.
Auctore Clarissimo P. Benjamin Elbel, O.S.F. Novis
Curis Edidit P. F. Irenæus Bierbaum, O.S.F., Pro-
vinciæ Saxonæ S. Crucis Lector Jubilatus.

FATHER ELBEL wrote his valuable work on theology in the first part of the last century. It passed rapidly through several editions; and has received the warmest praise and the highest commendations from the principal writers on moral theology since that time. It is constantly quoted by St. Liguori and Gury; whilst Lehmkuhl writes of its author: "Inter primarios scriptores theologiae moralis numerandus." We are glad, then, that the work is being republished under the care of Father Bierbaum of the same Order.

The whole work will be republished in ten parts. As yet only the first part has appeared, which treats of human acts, conscience, laws, and sins; the remaining parts will appear in due course within the next two years.

It is unnecessary for us to write a detailed review of a work which has been before the world, and has elicited unstinted praise from theologians for a period of more than a century. It is written in the form of conferences. Each conference consists of—(1) a summary of the contents of the conference; (2) an exposition of theological principles; (3) a statement of practical cases, similar to those in Gury's "*Casus Conscientiae*," and the application of the principles already explained to them; and (4) the *conference* concludes with a section of "*Corollaria*." The treatment of questions in this first part which we have received, is remarkable for its great order and lucidity, its solidity and admirable application of principles to the solution of practical cases. Answers that are at variance with recent decrees of the Roman Congregations will be corrected in this edition. We can strongly recommend this work to priests who are anxious to add a good treatise on theology to their library.

D. C.

THE SCIENCE OF THE SAINTS IN PRACTICE. By Father Pagani. New Edition, 3 vols. London: Burns & Oates.

A BOOK on any of the natural sciences written forty years ago would, doubtless, be regarded to-day as antiquated and out of date.

The march of mind has left the men of science of the past a long way behind; much of their teaching has had to be modified, and much must now be set aside as no longer tenable. Not so, however, with regard to *The Science of the Saints*, or *The Science of the Supernatural Life*. And although sanctity appears in ever new and varying forms, and admits of indefinite progress, yet the science or theory of the supernatural, which from the beginning until now has been practically applied by the saints in the lives they led, has ever been the same, and there is nothing new to be added to it. Therefore a spiritual book of forty years ago, written by a master of the spiritual life, should be as welcome to-day as it was then. Such a work can never become antiquated, or fall behind in modern progress.

The Science of the Saints, by Father Pagani, of the Fathers of Charity, is well-known in this country, and will still be found on the shelves of many a Catholic library side by side with *The Lives of the Saints*, from which its spiritual honey has been chiefly extracted. But the work is becoming rare, and for some time past out of print. To meet this want a new edition of *The Science of the Saints* is now being published by Messrs. Burns & Oates, and the first of three volumes in which it will appear is already in the hands of the booksellers.

As, however, there are many to whom the book will appear new, a brief notice of the author and his work will help, no doubt, to make its value appreciated again, as it was forty years ago. Father Pagani, the saintly author, was regarded in his day as a man of great spiritual discernment and penetration, as well as of singular meekness and sweetness, which peculiarly fitted him for the direction of souls. Before entering the Institute of Charity, of which he afterwards became the second general, Father Pagani was spiritual director of the Seminary of Novara, and it was here that he first manifested a wonderful spiritual influence which charmed so much those who placed themselves under his direction. Here also he wrote his first book, *Anima Divota, or Devout Soul*, which for its sweet spiritual fragrance found such favour among the pious of his native land, that to this day it remains one of the most popular books of devotion in Italy. Translated into English by the author, it is also well-known in this country.

The Science of the Saints is a practical treatise on the principal Christian virtues, abundantly illustrated with interesting

examples from Holy Scripture as well as from *The Lives of the Saints*. It was written chiefly for devout souls such as are trying to live an interior and supernatural life by following in the footsteps of our Lord and His saints. Hence this work is eminently adapted for the use of ecclesiastics and of religious communities, since such are specially called by God to aspire to a higher perfection of life than is usually attained by ordinary Christians.

The author, following the course of the year, treats of twelve Christian virtues, proposing one of these for consideration during the whole of each month. But as every virtue may be regarded from many different points of view, so Father Pagani for each day of the month unfolds to the reader a special charm and attraction of the virtue under consideration, illustrating it with suitable examples from the lives of the saints. Thus we have a virtue, or a different aspect of a virtue, illustrated in life, as subject-matter for pious meditation on each day of the year. Now, there is a very great advantage to be derived from this classification of the examples of the saints according to the order of the virtues. For not only by this grouping of examples are we better able to retain them in the memory, but what is of still greater importance, we are able to note how the virtues thus separately set forth in order in *The Science of the Saints*, really repeat themselves as the characteristic features of *all* God's saints, and so we become accustomed to recognise a certain order of virtue in true sanctity, and to distinguish also in the lives of the saints between what is substantial and what is merely accidental in the many extraordinary things they did. For the above reasons it would seem that *The Science of the Saints* thus arranged may be, perhaps, even more useful as a guide to the interior life than the indiscriminate reading of *The Lives of the Saints*. The work, originally written by the author in English, and dedicated by him to the present Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, at a time when the latter was a simple priest, now comes out in its new form with the *imprimatur* of his eminence. We think the pious reader will find *The Science of the Saints* charming spiritual reading.

IDOLS; OR THE SECRET OF THE RUE CHAUSSÉE D'ANTIN.

By Raoul de Navey. Translated from the French. By Anna T. Sadlier. Dublin: M. H. Gill.

It is admitted on all sides that bad literature is one of the greatest evils of our time. Every missionary priest has experience of the baneful effects it produces, especially amongst the young.

In newspapers, periodicals, and books, it penetrates everywhere, makes victims in all grades, insinuates its poison in every direction with the most fatal results. It sullies the imagination, perverts the intelligence, corrupts the heart, darkens and smothers the conscience. In recent years the "novel" has become a favourite medium for communicating what is most vicious in the heart, as well as what is most false and misleading in the mind of man. An art which is in itself noble and elevating has been turned from its purpose to be made the fascinating purveyor of error and of vice. It seems to many that on account of the extraordinary licence which the press enjoys in modern times the only effective antidote to such an evil is the production of a light literature, which, whilst neglecting none of the devices of art, will keep clear of the shoals on which so many have been lost, and supply the votaries of fiction with sound and moral works. This was the idea which inspired the Countess Hahn-Hahn, in Germany, and sustained her in the laborious task of furnishing the reading public of that country with a series of novels which, for purity of language, fertility of thought and imagination, elevation of ideas, artistic development of plots, scenes, and narration, hold the very highest place in modern German literature.

It was a similar reaction in Italy which produced, perhaps the only Italian novel, if it can be so designated, which has acquired world-wide fame. In France the writers of bad novels, numerous though they are, have not had the field of fiction entirely to themselves. Foremost amongst those whose works in that country have exercised a benign and salutary influence over the present generation are Raoul de Naverly, Zenäide, Fleuriot, Eugenie de Guerin, Paul Féval, and to a large extent also M. Xavier Marmier and M. Octave Feuillet, both distinguished members of the Academy. Whilst making full acknowledgment of what has been done on the same lines in both England and Ireland, we welcome this excellent translation of one of M. Raoul de Naverly's best works. The story is thrilling enough for any nerves, but it is told with a certain power of restraint which enables the author to captivate his reader, and fascinate him along to the very last chapter. And the general effect is good; the narration is often highly dramatic; the tone is earnestly Catholic and pure; the moral impression excellent. The pictures of family life which it unveils—if we leave the tragic element

aside—are true to the life; Benedict Fougerais, the Abbé Pomereul, Sabine, are perfect. Some of the minor characters are not quite so natural; but allowances have to be made for fiction. The establishment in the Rue Git-le-Coeur is the Parisian counterpart of Fagan's den, and the resort of Bill Sykes in London; but Jean Machû is a much more desperate villain than his brethren of the London confraternity. We do not care very much to find the seal of the confessional made the pivot of such stories; but as it has been done at all this author has used it not only with telling artistic force, but with the greatest reverence for the subject, and an uncommon insight into the ways of Providence and the working of grace in the human heart. The translation is free, pure, and natural. With the exception of a few Gallicisms, which are almost inevitable, it could scarcely be better. We heartily wish it the success which it deserves.

J. F. H.

CASSELL'S NEW GERMAN DICTIONARY. German-English and English-German. London: Cassell & Co.

THIS is, we believe, a great improvement on any German dictionary hitherto published. It costs just about one-third the price of Flügel's, is made up in one compact volume, and is printed in clear type. The German-English part of it is specially good. It contains a vast number of words, and gives a much larger and more satisfactory list of examples, with directions and combinations under each word, than Flügel's or any others. Students engaged in the study of German could not make a better investment.

RATIONAL RELIGION. By the Rev. John Conway.
Milwaukee: Hoffmann Brothers.

CONSIDERING the vast ground which Father Conway goes over in this small volume we cannot expect to find any of the numerous subjects it touches upon exhaustively treated. Indeed, the author's object seems to have been to present to busy men of the world, both Catholic and non-Catholic, a succinct and practical compendium of Catholic teaching on all the great questions that lie at the foundation of religion, supporting these truths of Catholic dogma with short, pithy, and suggestive arguments, and employing the same brief though varied method in the destructive criticism of his opponents. In this object Father Conway has very well succeeded, and, we have no doubt, his book will do good amongst the class of readers for whom it is intended.

HOLY LIVES. I. THE LEPER QUEEN. II. THE BLESSED ONES OF 1888. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE two volumes of this series before us can be heartily recommended as very useful books for parochial libraries, and also to heads of schools, as beautiful and instructive prizes for boys and girls.

I. *The Leper Queen* is an edifying legend of the self-sacrifice of Aleidis, the daughter of a Hungarian Count. The remnant of the sixth crusade brought back from the East the dreaded leprosy. It spread rapidly, and "make way for the leper," became a familiar cry in the streets of many a town in Hungary. The poor wretches who were struck were hurried away to the pent-houses, from which they were released only by death. Aleidis, wishing to devote her life to the poor lepers, prayed that she might be attacked by the disease, in order to escape marriage. Her prayer was heard, and on the day of her betrothal the leper's mark was discovered on her head. She then devoted the remainder of her life to attending the lepers.

II. *The Blessed Ones of 1888* contains sketches of the lives of the four whom Leo XIII., in the year of his Sacerdotal Jubilee, numbered amongst the beatified. The work of translation from the original German has been very well done by E. A. Donnelly.

I. ON THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. By Dr. Vaughan; Burns & Oates.

II. THE GARDEN OF DIVINE LOVE. By Rev. J. A. Maltus, O.P.: Burns & Oates.

III. THE SEVEN DOLOURS. By Kenelm Digby Best, Burns & Oates.

IV. THE SODALITY MANUAL. By Rev. J. A. Cullen, S.J. M. H. Gill & Son.

I. To the ordinary Catholic reader, as well as to the missionary priest, this little *brochure* of the Bishop of Salford cannot fail to be a most useful book for spiritual reading. The object which the writer proposed to himself—to give an explanation of the great Sacrifice of the New Law, and of the benefits to be derived therefrom—is fully attained. Even within its narrow limits we have much of what has been written by the great Fathers of the Church on the subject; nor are Cardinal Newman and Father Dalgairns passed over. From every point of view, this little book is to be considered a valuable addition to our Catholic literature.

II. This is a collection of very touching and beautiful prayers. It is a most suitable book of devotion, and will be found very useful in making thanksgiving after Holy Communion.

III. This is a little volume of hymns of the Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin, by a priest of the Oratory. Many of the hymns are very beautiful, and embody in appropriate rhythmic lines striking thoughts on the subject.

IV. This is an excellent prayer-book for members of sodalities. It contains, besides prayers for Mass, holy Communion, &c., the Office of the Dead, and the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. It is clearly printed, and well brought out, by Messrs. Gill, and bears the *imprimatur* of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.

EUCCHARISTIC JEWELS. By Percy Fitzgerald. Burns & Oates.

THIS is a companion volume to the *Jewels of the Mass*, by the same author, and, like it, is a charming little work. Although it consists for the most part of quotations from the Fathers and great Catholic writers on the Blessed Eucharist, yet they are so admirably selected and interwoven, that one almost forgets it is the work of different men. The writer's own passages are in a highly ornate and very pleasing style. Altogether the setting of these jewels displays the work of a master-hand.

A STRING OF PEARLS. From Longfellow. Selected and arranged by V. R. T. London: R. Washbourne, 18, Paternoster-row. 1890.

WE have very great pleasure in noticing this tiny and beautiful volume of selections from Longfellow. It is aptly styled a *String of Pearls*; for as pearls are emblematic of tears, and tears are the expression of deep feeling, so these selections are from a poet whose distinguishing characteristic is pathos, and whose leading quality is, like the pearl, childlike simplicity. The little gems are beautiful, indeed, and beautifully set—so beautiful that one would wish they had been more numerous; for as the compiler has told us in the words of Longfellow:—

“I have but marked the place,
But half the secret told;
That, following this slight trace,
Others may find the gold.”

The little volume has already run to a second edition, and we know no more beautiful and cheap present than this charming *String of Pearls*.

J. C.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MARCH, 1891.

RÉNAN AND THE KINGS OF ISRAEL.

AT last the third volume of M. Rénan's *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel* has appeared, and with it is completed the sketch of the kings of Israel. A dramatic and highly-coloured picture, surely; but very misleading, and disfigured with numberless blots of bias and prejudice. How could it be otherwise? The narrative of Samuel and Kings is treated in the most arbitrary fashion—rejected or admitted, apparently according to the caprice of the writer, whilst next to no weight is attached to the books of Chronicles. "What these modern historiographies add," says M. Rénan,¹ "to the old accounts of the books of Samuel and Kings is of little value." Can we be surprised, then, if we find M. Rénan's history of the kings often little better than a caricature of the true story of the kingdom of Israel?

In the eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of the first book of Samuel the story is told of the establishment of the kingly power in Israel. Everything sacred and supernatural in the institution and functions of the kings, M. Rénan is determined to remove; and, accordingly, he proceeds to set forth their duties and position in the following words:²—

"The king, or *melek*, so enthusiastically demanded—evidently because the circumstances of the century demanded him—is obviously the *basileus* of the Homeric Greeks. The *basileus*, as his name indicates, marches at the head of the people, leads his

¹ Vol. ii., page 3, note.

Vol. i., page 391.

people to battle, staff in hand ; such is his duty, such his office. He is the German *Herzog*. Enormous transformations were necessary for a royalty instituted under such auspices to become a sort of sacrament."

With the idea of reducing the rôle of the Hebrew kings to that of a mere leader in the fight, M. Rénan compares them with the *basileus* of the Homeric Greeks. He could not have been more unfortunate in his illustration. For it is beyond all question that the *basileus* of Homer was something far more than merely a general to marshal the people for battle. Aristotle, speaking of the kings (*βασιλεῖς*) of the Heroic or Homeric age, tells us,¹ *κύριοι ᾗσαν τε κατὰ πόλεμον ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν, ὅσαι μὴ ἱερατικάι² καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις τὰς δίκας ἔκρινον*—from which passage it is clear that their jurisdiction extended not over the battle-field alone, but also over the administration of justice, as judges and defenders of right ; and over the services of religion, as offerers of sacrifice to the gods. It is clear that Aristotle and Rénan are at variance. Which of the two is right? Dr. Grote, perhaps the leading authority on Grecian history, evidently follows the opinion of Aristotle.

"In war [he says³ of the Homeric king] he is the leader, foremost in personal prowess, and directing all military movements ; in peace he is the general protector of the injured and oppressed ; he further offers up these public prayers and sacrifices which are intended to obtain for the whole people the favour of the gods."

Furthermore, as illustrating what in Greece was considered to be the most important duty of the kingly office, after the abolition of the kings, the sacrificial function alone remained connected with the name of king. Thus, when in Athens, in the year 683 B.C., the duties of the kings of old were divided among the nine archons, it was not the leader in war that was called the *archon-basileus*, but the archon that represented the king as high priest of the nation.⁴

¹ *Politics*, 13, 4, 12.

² "Sacrifices requiring a priest acquainted with special rites."—Jebb (*Introduction to Homer*, page 48, note).

³ *History of Greece*, vol. ii., page 5.

⁴ The commander was known as *ὁ πολέμαρχος*.

M. Rénan is therefore completely in error as to the duties of the Homeric *basileus*. Is he likely to be any more accurate in regard to the Hebrew *melek*? He read in the first book of Samuel the exclamation of the people, that their king was to go out before them and fight their battles for them, and then his facile pen apparently rushed impetuously on, describing the completely warlike character of the Jewish king; and he illustrated his view with a completely imaginary description of the duties of the Homeric king. In his enthusiasm he clearly forgot that the people in the very same passage¹ ask in the first place for a king to judge (*i.e.*, to rule) them; and that, on the occasion of their first request for a king,² they ask only for "a king to judge us, as all nations have," saying nothing at all about wars or battles.

M. Rénan entertains a very low estimate of the kingdom of Israel during the period when it was under the rule of Saul, David and Solomon. Thus, of David:—

"There existed neither religion nor written legislation. Family life, strongly established amongst his subjects, relieved the sovereign from many cares. The government of David may thus be conceived as something very simple and very strong. We may imagine it upon the model of the petty royalty of Abderkader at Mascara, or according to the dynastic attempts we see in our own day in Abyssinia. The manner in which things go on at the court of such a *negus*, at Magdala or at Gondar, is a perfect image of the royalty of David, in his *millu* of Sion. The distribution and duties of the officials, the organization of the revenues, the fidelity of the ministers, the character of the writings, still few in number, would probably offer to the traveller acquainted with Biblical matters, who should visit Abyssinia, strange points of resemblance."³

The Biblical scholar travelling to Abyssinia, would be sure to fall in with a copy of the Pentateuch there. Would M. Rénan allow that such a volume was to be found in Israel in David's time? Indeed, M. Rénan seems to us to give a very unfaithful picture of the kingdom of Israel in its early days. Abyssinia is a country grown old in Christianity; for the Christian religion has existed there since the days of Constantine. Sixteen hundred years ago the authority of the emperors was well established; in our own days,

¹ 1 Sam. viii. 20.

² 1 Sam. viii. 5.

³ Vol. ii., page 2.

however, anarchy has prevailed there to such an extent, that at one period, not many years ago, eight persons were alive, each of whom had been emperor. Indeed the emperor's authority is but little, and the governors of provinces are continually at war with one another.¹

Does this picture give us a correct idea of the kingdom over which David and Solomon ruled? Certainly, if so, the resemblance is very slight. The Jewish monarchy was young, only at its beginning. Still it was full of vital force. Witness the energy with which David got the upper hand of his enemies on every side. "The neighbouring peoples, Hebrew, Chananæan, Aramean, Philistine, to the heights of Hermon and the desert, were vigorously subjected, and more or less made tributary."² Then David and Solomon were both firmly planted at the head of affairs. "Everyone," says M. *Rénan*, of David,³ "feared him; an order of his was executed from Dan to Beër-Seba." Nor was this so for himself alone; he transmitted the crown to his sons, and the kingdom remained in his family, as M. *Rénan* admits,⁴ for four centuries. More than this, David began, and Solomon completed, the building and beautifying of Jerusalem; so that, thanks to the riches and activity of Solomon, "Jerusalem rivalled the most brilliant cities of Egypt and Phœnicia."⁵ Skilled workmen from Tyre, and the most costly materials from foreign parts were employed on the works; the ambassadors of Solomon appeared at distant courts; he formed an alliance with the powerful kingdom of Egypt;⁶ whilst his ships, built at Asiongeber, on the Red Sea, accomplished voyages "to Ophir, that is to say, to Western India."⁷ In a word, even from M. *Rénan*'s admissions, it is clear that the kingdom grew rapidly in power and resources during David's reign, and occupied a position of importance and dignity under the sceptre of Solomon, his successor.

What are we to say of M. *Rénan*'s estimate of King David's character? To speak plainly, it is a gross and wanton insult to the memory of the Psalmist of Israel, the ancestor

¹ *English Encyclopædia* (Knight). Geography, Abyssinia.

² Vol. ii., page 43.

³ Vol. ii., page 1.

⁴ Vol. ii., page 72.

Vol. ii., chap. xi

⁶ Vol. ii., page 121.

⁷ Vol. ii., page 114.

of Jesus Christ. "He was capable," says M. *Rénan*,¹ of the greatest crimes, when the circumstances required it." Again, "what is especially extraordinary in his fortune, is the fact that his enemies died at the very moment that his greater "good required it." In another place³ he says that to his other qualities he joined "the doubtful art of profiting by every crime, without ever directly committing any." In fact, remarks and insinuations such as these, painting the character of David as that of an unscrupulous and hypocritical wretch, recur constantly through the account of his life. He is represented as a man at the bottom of every deed of violence, yet so contriving as outwardly to appear a gentle and unoffending soul.

What is the evidence for this atrocious charge? Saul and Jonathan disappeared at the moment most opportune for David.⁴ Joab, David's commander-in-chief, got rid of Abner, the general of the party of Saul.⁵ "David," says M. *Rénan*, "affected to be inconsolable. He had to be forced to take food." Isbaal, son of Saul, was assassinated in his sleep at Mahanaïm.⁶ Absalom, having revolted from his father, was slain in battle by the soldiers of Joab.⁷ Joab also murdered Amasa, his rival.⁸ Finally, M. *Rénan* says,⁹ alluding to the last testament of David to his son Solomon, "he showed the black perfidy of his hypocritical soul in what related to Joab and Semei." He is alluding to David's directions to his son to see that Joab and Semei do not go unpunished for their crimes.

Now, in regard to the last instance adduced by M. *Rénan*, we may say at once it is a flagrant instance of the gross unfairness he displays in the treatment of his subject. For our own part, we think it enough explanation of David's direction to his son in regard to Joab and Semei to point to Joab's many crimes and Semei's exposed treachery. They both deserved punishment; and it was natural for David not to wish his son, at the outset of his career, to fall into the hands of two such men. But how does the matter stand in the

¹ Vol. i., page 413.² Vol. i., page 430.³ Vol. i., page 438.⁴ Vol. i., page 430.⁵ Vol. i., page 441.⁶ Vol. i., page 442.⁷ Vol. ii., page 82.⁸ Vol. ii., page 87.⁹ Vol. ii., page 92.

case of M. *Rénan*? He prides himself upon being a historian who bases his narrative upon the most approved critical results. He is not slow to point out any passages in the books of *Kings* that are, according to "critics," of doubtful authority. Will it be believed, then, that the chapter of *Kings* upon which he bases this odious charge against David is such a passage? Yet not a word of doubt is thrown upon it. "The testament attributed to him (David) in 1 *Kings*, ii.," says Wellhausen,¹ "cannot be justly laid to his charge; it is the libel of a later hand seeking to invest him with a fictitious glory." Upon what principle of honesty, then, can M. *Rénan*, with his views of "critical science," bring such a charge as this against King David, without a word of qualification, upon the authority of a passage which he must consider, to say the least, of very dubious authority?

But, looking at the whole case, and fully prepared to stand by the narrative of *Kings* in its entirety, we may say that M. *Rénan's* case rests upon no solid foundation. Wellhausen,² the leading "critic" of the day, says of King David, "his personal character has often been treated with undue disparagement." He finds the explanation of many of his deeds in the rude age in which he lived; and, finally, he says, "it is unjust to hold him responsible for the deaths of Abner and Amasa, or to attribute to him any conspiracy with the hierocracy for the destruction of Saul."

But on what does M. *Rénan* really base his charge against David? The cause and circumstances of the deaths of David's enemies which are referred to in the books of *Kings*, are there assigned. Upon what authority, then, does M. *Rénan* make David responsible for them? Upon certain documents, apparently, that existed—so he says—before "the narratives were arranged in such a way as that he might not be responsible." In the preface to the first volume of his history, M. *Rénan* said: "I admit that any opinions as to individuals are, save in exceptional cases, only possible within an historic period either very rich in documents or very near our own." We are dealing here with an individual

¹ *Israel*, page 455. This is obviously not our view.

² *Israel*, page 455.

³ Vol. ii., page 87.

who lived three thousand years ago. No documents exist sustaining M. *Rénan's* contention. The most that can be said is, that he suspects that over two thousand years ago such documents did exist; and on the strength of these he judges and condemns the Psalmist of Israel. Nothing more unjust could be conceived. Well, at least his conclusion is based on the teaching of the new "criticism"? No. Wellhausen, the leader of the modern school, is directly opposed to him. The fact is, the case is bolstered up by rejecting for the moment the principles of the science he is supposed to follow, and by making use of any means, fair or foul, to defile and vilify the character of the ancestor of Jesus Christ.

After the death of Solomon a schism took place in the kingdom.¹ Two kings reigned in Israel—one in the north, and one in the south—till the destruction of Samaria, in the year 721 B.C. M. *Rénan* has no difficulty in assigning the cause of the separation.

"The cause [he says²] that led the tribes of Israel³ to separate from the kingdom centralized at Jerusalem was the prevailing taste for freedom of life as of old. We have often had occasion to say that the old tribal spirit, the habits of the nomad and patriarchal life, still lived in Joseph. Such a spirit lent itself to no great organization, either civil, military, or religious."

The idea of "the tribal spirit" seems to have taken firm hold of M. *Rénan's* mind, and it is regularly "trotted out" as an explanation of many of the important problems connected with the history of the chosen people. The ordinary reader of Israelitish history will probably see sufficient reasons to account for the division of the kingdom without having recourse to the "tribal spirit" hypothesis. He will, doubtless, find the explanation of it in the heavy exactions and rigorous government of the late king, and also in the exceptional exemptions allowed to Juda, and the general discontent aroused by Solomon's innovations. Add to all this the exasperating conduct of the new king and the

¹ Date uncertain. Probably between 975 and 950 B.C.

² Vol. ii., page 192.

³ The north kingdom was called Israel; the south kingdom, Juda.

existence of a popular opponent to him in the person of Jeroboam, and the causes of the rupture become adequately explained. Nor is it easy to see how the establishment of a separate monarchy in the north could have any effect other than that of centralizing more than ever the government of the country, by diminishing the extent of the kingdom, and increasing the need for expenditure, armaments, and fortified towns to defend the people against foreign attacks.

At all events, during the reign of Roboam, the kingdom of Israel was divided into two kingdoms, and so continued till, with the fall of Samaria, the north kingdom came to an end in the year 721 B.C. We may lay down a very simple rule by which M. Rénan's estimate of the kings that ruled during that period can be ascertained. He invariably takes a view in opposition to that held by the writers of Kings and Chronicles. At the very least, he finds reasons to question the accuracy of the sacred writer, to say a good word for kings represented as bad, or to make dark insinuations against God-fearing monarchs. Achab is "a remarkable sovereign—brave, intelligent, moderate, devoted to the ideas of civilization."¹ "Cunning cruelty made up the character of Jehu."² It was Joas' firmness towards the clergy that gave him a bad name.³ And so, through the long list of sovereigns, M. Rénan, relying upon his wonderful power of reading between the lines, draws a picture of the kings completely at variance with that of the sacred writers.

About the year 765 or 760 B.C. a new power made its first appearance in the valleys of the Orontes and of the Jordan. It was the Assyrian empire.

"The Grecian empire⁴ [says M. Rénan, in words with which we are, speaking generally, in accord], the Roman empire, and, to a certain point, the Persian empire, have been forgiven their violence, because of the general good they have procured, and the contribution they have made to human progress. The Assyrian empire appears to have done nothing but harm. We can see no idea it has propagated, no good cause it has served. Like the Tartar empires of the middle age, it has passed along only to

¹ Vol. ii., page 301.

³ Vol. ii., page 412.

² Vol. ii., page 316.

⁴ Vol. ii., page 455.

destroy. Perhaps, however, the Tartar blood already predominated in these terrible hordes, and the sombre conquerors who terrified the eighth century before Jesus Christ had more than a mere external relation with the Turks, with Attila, and with Gengiskhan."

Such was the power with which Israel was now brought in contact. "It was the first appearance of military force in the world," and "the result was a brutal despotism." Immense numbers of *bas-reliefs* show us this ancient military system at work. Scenes of torture are represented with as much care and relish as scenes of victory. The king is the centre of the picture. There is no great minister, no great captain, no great painter. The king is everything; besides him there are but soldiers, servants, executioners. The lot of the prisoner in the hands of such men as these was horrible in the extreme. Captivity came to be regarded as the great calamity of life.

"As a general tendency," says M. Rénan,¹ "the prophets will be in favour of Assyria." And, again,² speaking of Osee: "The pressure of Assyria is already so strong that the seer dares to predict the captivity of the two kingdoms, and even to announce that the people will take refuge in Egypt, as indeed, will happen one hundred and seventy-five years later, after the taking of Jerusalem." The first of these statements is clearly untrue. The mere brutality of the Assyrians, and the horror in which they were held—as made clear by M. Rénan himself—is sufficient refutation of the statement. The real explanation of the position of the prophets is contained in the second quotation. Constantly throughout his history M. Rénan records³ the forcible language of these holy men against the idolatry, injustice, extortion, ungodliness, and other sins of kings, priests, and people. They warn the nation against the vengeance of heaven. Now, the Assyrians appear on the scene, and the prophets point to them as a scourge of God. However much they dread them, they declare them to be the instrument of God's punishment, and

¹ Vol. ii., page 465.

² Vol. ii., page 467.

³ Cf. ii., chap. xix. (Osee); chap. xxi. (Isaiah), &c.

they foretell the certain doom of Israel. They have no love for the Assyrians, but they boldly proclaim the will of God.

Assyria first swooped down upon Israel about the year 735 B.C. Manahen was then king of Israel. He submitted, and paid the barbarian conqueror one thousand talents of silver. Not long after Achaz, king of Juda, called in the help of the Assyrian monarch to aid him against Israel. Meanwhile Osee came to the throne of the north kingdom. The state of disorganization in his dominions was complete. On the other hand, the Assyrian power was at its height, under the rule of Salmanasar, successor of Theglathphalasar, who was emperor of all hither Asia. Osee at first bought off his hostility by submission and the payment of a tribute; then he intrigued with Egypt against his master. Isaiah was for submission. "The alliance with Egypt," said he,¹ "is but lying and perfidy." It was now too late to recede, for Salmanasar was coming down upon Israel like a blight. For three years Samaria held out against him. Then it fell, and all the notable portion of the population was taken into captivity. The north kingdom was at an end, after an existence of about two centuries and a half.

We have had occasion before to speak of the Hebrew prophets. The prophet or *nabi* of Israel differed from the *μάντρες* of the Greeks and the *vates* of the Romans. The prophets both in Greece and in Rome were members of a profession; they had a regular place in the organization of the state. In Israel, the *nabi* was a man apart; he was not necessarily connected with the priesthood; his appearance was erratic, and depended upon the special mission of God. It is true, M. Rénan speaks of them as organized in bodies. "What gave its chief strength to Jahveist prophetism," he says,² "was its corporate organization, with its adepts and novices," an organization which went by the name of "the sons of the prophets." Though married, they lived in little cells, ate together, and assembled in the community-rooms for exercises in common, above all to hear their master." Such is his statement. But there is no evidence to show

¹ Vol. ii., page 521.

² Vol. ii., page 279.

that the schools to which he refers were anything more than bodies of religious men united together with the view of serving God.

As usual, M. *Rénan* has formed a somewhat startling opinion as to the character of the prophets. "The prophet of the eighth century is therefore," he says,¹ "a journalist in the open air, himself declaiming his article . . . His first object was to reach the people, to assemble the crowd. For that purpose, the prophet did not reject any of these extravagant expedients which the modern publicist thinks he has invented." Again, to take another instance.² "Jerusalem possessed a band of loud talkers (*i.e.*, the prophets), whom we can compare only with the radical journalists of our own day, and who rendered all government impossible." Let these two instances suffice. Over and over again M. *Rénan* compares the Hebrew prophets to the journalists, the radicals,³ the radical journalists of the present day.

These passages, and the line of thought they represent, are an excellent illustration of the shallowness that pervades M. *Rénan's* history. The modern radical speaks in support of the lower orders; the prophet was the protector of the poor. The radical journalist is violent in his methods of attracting attention; the prophet not unfrequently made use of dramatic effect to gain the ear of the people. The radical is opposed to war; the prophet at times declaimed against the folly of resisting the Assyrians and Babylonians. Therefore the general conclusion: the prophet of the eighth century is the journalist of to-day; he can only be compared with the radical journalist of our own day. Could any proposition be more extravagant?

M. *Rénan* himself points out⁴ "that a triple barrier of prejudices—religious, moral, and social—estranged Israel from all that which other peoples regarded as progress. Its ideal was behindhand, in a life which it considered as the only one worthy of the free man, the pastoral or agricultural life," &c.; and in the sentence before he states that "more

¹ Vol. ii., page 422.

² Vol. iii., page 277.

³ The radicals here referred to are foreign radicals.

⁴ " Vol. ii., page 266.

than ever the prophets, preachers of these great reactionary dogmata, became the interpreters of the true sentiment of the nation." The prophets, therefore, represented the views of the nation, and the nation was opposed to progress—so says M. *Rénan*. Still we are to believe that the prophets of old represented the journalist and radical of our days.

In reality the two classes of men differed *toto cælo*, and nothing will give us a better idea of the difference between them than the productions of the two. The articles of the radical journalist are ephemeral; they will not bear examination; they die with the day which gave them birth. The words of the prophets have been handed down from generation to generation; they are golden words; they will live for ever. The radical is an enemy of religion; the prophet was a man profoundly possessed with the spirit of piety and holiness. The radical lives like his neighbours; he pretends only to increase the creature comforts of the people. The prophet was a man of the strictest and most ascetical life. He sought the honour of God alone: he fearlessly denounced the unjust man: he threatened the sinner: he upheld the weak and oppressed: his prophecies as to the future told of a kingdom, not of this world, but a spiritual kingdom, where peace and justice should reign—in fact, the Church of God.

What views did the prophets hold as to the life to come? M. *Rénan* is quite clear upon the point. "Never is the least appeal made by the sages of this time," he says,¹ "to rewards and punishments beyond the grave." Again, speaking of the prophet Amos,² he says that "he shows clearly by his conduct that the people believed neither in rewards or punishments to come, and wished, consequently, the reign of absolute justice here below." Is it clear from the writings of the Old Testament that neither prophets nor people believed in rewards or punishments hereafter? Far from it. To take but one instance, Job, in the book of Job, which M. *Rénan* assigns to the reign of Ezechias, in the eighth century B.C., expresses the hope that "he will rise out of the

¹ Vol. iii., page 22.

Vol. ii., page 434.

earth on the last day," and that "he will see God."¹ This too because of his sufferings and tribulations here below. Indeed, M. Rénan is able to make the statement he does only by ignoring the fact that the word *scheol* is not always used merely of the grave, but sometimes also of hell, the place of punishment of the wicked.

With his usual confidence, and fully assured that he has made out his case on this subject, M. Rénan remarks:² "The reality in this matter presented strange difficulties to the most easily satisfied of thinkers, seeing that the good man is often unfortunate, and the wicked apparently as often rewarded. Jahveism was engulfed in this abyss." He continues with his usual flippancy: "Jahve, questioned upon the chapter of his providence, gives no reply except in the form of claps of thunder. The government of the world is perfectly just without men being able to say how." All this is empty rhetoric—it proves too much. Certainly the prophets would require to have been much more simple than M. Rénan gives them credit for having been, if their views on the future life were such as he asserts. The belief in perfect justice of Jahve was universal in Israel. Day after day the good man was seen afflicted and in misfortune, whilst the sinner prospered and enjoyed length of days; and still we are to believe that the prophets, full of zeal and uprightness, went on teaching the justice of God, and that this justice is manifested entirely in this life. The idea is absurd. It becomes more so when we know that it is certain that the Israelites believed in a future life. Indeed, apart from other proof, their belief in necromancy,³ which M. Rénan says "was more in vogue than ever" in the eighth century, makes this fact clear. Are we to suppose then that the Israelites believed in a life beyond the grave, but considered that after death God's justice was no longer brought into play? In reality the only reasonable explanation of the words and actions of the prophets is the supposition that they believed in rewards and punishments, not only in this life, but also in that which is to come.

¹ Job xix. 25-26.

² Vol. iii., page 22.

³ Cf. Saul at Endor.

Though we have a far higher idea of the prophets than M. Rénan, still he accords to them one honour to which, in our opinion, they have no claim. The Hexateuch—*i.e.*, the Pentateuch with the book of Josue—was, according to M. Rénan, the creation of Hebrew prophetism. It will be necessary for us now, as briefly as we can, to sketch out M. Rénan's views as to the origin of the Hexateuch.

"The use of writing," says M. Rénan,¹ "was widely spread under David and Solomon." Still we are to suppose that at that time not a line of the Pentateuch had been written. There existed, however—so says M. Rénan—two sets of traditions; one relating to the primitive history of man, the deluge, &c., of Babylonian or Harranian origin,² embracing also souvenirs of Ur-Casdim and Abraham, and tales about Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph in Egypt; the other, more historical in character, though not entirely free from fable, beginning with the sojourn of the tribes on the confines of Egypt, consisting of stories regarding the deliverance from Egypt, Moses, and the passage through the desert. These various traditions resulted in a book of patriarchal and other legends. "From this double series of traditions," says M. Rénan,³ "resulted two consecutive writings; or rather, perhaps, what people considered to be but one book." This was in the tenth century B.C.

Besides this book of legends we are to imagine—the imagination plays an important part in M. Rénan's theory—the existence of two collections of hymns or songs; one of them, the book of the Wars of the Lord, referred to in the book of Numbers;⁴ the other, the book of the Just, referred to in the book of Josue.⁵ No one questions the existence of two books bearing these names; but we fail to see upon what grounds M. Rénan refers their authorship to the tenth century B.C. His motive is obvious: to gain an argument against the Mosaic authorship of the book of Numbers, since there is a reference in that book to the book of the Wars of the Lord. But it is not at all so clear why these books should not

¹ Vol. ii., page 205. ² Vol. ii., page 206. ³ Vol. ii., page 208.

⁴ Num. xxi. 14, &c.

⁵ Jos. x. 13.

have been made up of chants, added at various times, and dating back, in part at least, to the very commencement of the wanderings in the desert. However, according to M. *Rénan*, these two books of chants belong to the tenth century B.C.

We have now to advance rather more than a century, remembering that there existed two distinct kingdoms in Israel—the north kingdom and the south kingdom. About the year 850, in the reign of *Jehu*, M. *Rénan* tells us¹ that a redaction of its sacred history was carried out in the north kingdom. This redaction was the work of a prophet of the school of *Elias*, and it was founded in great measure upon the book of legends referred to above. The writer is known as the *Jehovist*, because of his constant use of the term *Jahve* or *Jehovah* for God, and his work is supposed to be contained chiefly in the book of *Genesis*, though parts of it are also to be found elsewhere in the *Hexateuch*. “There is no doubt,” says M. *Rénan*,² “that the writer who by agreement is called ‘the *Jehovist*,’ in undertaking his sacred history, had for his principal object to insert therein a code, summing up in a short form the precepts of *Jahve*.” Where is this code to be found? We are informed that it still exists in what is commonly called the book of the Covenant.³

So much for the north kingdom. In the south kingdom a similar work was undertaken some few years later, about 825 or 830 B.C. The writer who in this case is known as the *Elohist*, was, we are told,⁴ a priest of the temple of *Jerusalem*. He had at his disposal no such work as the book of legends of the northern kingdom, but he had many traditions common to both countries before the separation, and he had besides many documents, unknown in the north, which were preserved in the temple of *Jerusalem*. On the whole, the work of the *Elohist* was very like that of the *Jehovist*; and as the latter inserted in his redaction the legislative code known as the book of the Covenant, so the former included in his that well-known foundation of moral law, the *Decalogue*, or *Ten Commandments*.

¹ Vol. ii., page 361.

³ Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 19.

² Vol. ii., page 362.

⁴ Vol. ii., page 395.

In the year 721 B.C., the north kingdom came to an end, and soon the inconvenience of two sacred histories, so like and yet so divergent in detail, began to be felt. Accordingly, in the reign of Ezechias, the two narratives were welded together by an unknown hand. The resulting volume contained, M. Rénan assures us,¹ about one-half the present Hexateuch. Roughly speaking, neither Deuteronomy nor Leviticus was there, but most of the rest of the Hexateuch was there, and perhaps² the volume ended with the canticle of Moses, which now forms the thirty-second chapter of Deuteronomy.

Apparently the Israelites were still dissatisfied with their sacred history. We read in the fourth book of Kings,³ how, when some repairs were being made in the temple buildings, in the reign of Josias, the high-priest Helcias found in the temple the book of the Law, and gave it to Saphan the scribe, who, in his turn, delivered it to the king. This "book of the Law" was, in all probability, a very old copy of Deuteronomy, if not the original copy of Moses himself. M. Rénan is quite satisfied that the discovery of this book in the temple was all a fraud.⁴ It was no old book at all, that was found; but a new book, that had been hidden in the temple, and was brought out as the discovery of an old one. Jeremias the prophet he considers to have been the moving spirit in the matter; and he has no doubt the book discovered was our present Deuteronomy from chapter iv. 45 to the end of chapter xxviii. What, we may well ask, was the object of all this intrigue and deceit? "People wanted," says M. Rénan,⁵ "a book which would sum up the legislative ideal of the theocratic school—the rule of a perfect state under Jahve." Deuteronomy, which Helcias discovered in the temple, was supposed to supply this want. But then, M. Rénan tells us, that Deuteronomy "is only a new publication" of the old Law. It is based on the Decalogue, which was already known. "As regards the laws, the new code innovates very little. Upon nearly every point it only repeats the prescriptions of the book of the Covenant."⁶ This being

¹ Vol. iii., page 362.

Vol. iii., page 66.

³ Chapter xxii.⁴ Vol. iii., chap. xv.

Vol. iii., page 208.

⁶ Vol. iii., page 212.

so, how can it be said to have been a book satisfying the aspirations of the people? Is it at all likely then that Jeremias and the heads of the temple at Jerusalem¹ would have descended to all this deceit and fraud for the purpose of palming off on King Josias a book which contained little or nothing not already written in the sacred code of Israel?

Thus, according to M. Rénan, the book of Deuteronomy came into being. We have yet to account for the book of Leviticus; but we shall say only a brief word about it, as M. Rénan regards it as belonging to the period of the captivity, and it is therefore outside our subject. "As Jeremias was the inspirer of Deuteronomy, so was Ezechiel of Leviticus,"² says M. Rénan. And again, speaking of the twenty or five-and-twenty years that followed the captivity, he says, "nearly all the sacerdotal and levitical part of the *thora* appears to us, in substance, to belong to this period; the form was afterwards many times retouched." So that the book of Leviticus, and some kindred legislation in other parts of the Hexateuch would be substantially the work of the years preceding 560 B.C. After that, speaking roughly, the Hexateuch was complete, though M. Rénan is of opinion it underwent many re-editings at a later date.

Such, in brief, is M. Rénan's theory of the origin of the Hexateuch. Is it the unanimous decision of modern critical science? Far from it. The number of different theories is legion, and each theorizer defends his own particular views with the utmost confidence; in so doing, demolishing the edifices erected with much labour by his rivals. The result is a babel of discordant voices, each claiming to have solved the complex problem. The Catholic student can afford to regard the conflict with equanimity, confident that the sacred volume will emerge unscathed from the ordeal. In the present paper it is impossible for us to enter upon a detailed examination of the question, so we shall content

¹ Vol. iii., page 299.

² Vol. iii., page 432.

ourselves with making the following quotation from an eminent Catholic writer :¹—

“The difference of opinion amongst ‘critics’ is sufficiently great: we should never come to an end, if we endeavoured to enumerate and explain them all. No one, however, will experience any difficulty in finding a scheme to his taste. Any one who wishes to accept two authors of the Pentateuch, may have recourse to Tuch. Anyone who believes there were three, may consult Dr. Wette. The student who prefers four, can quote as his authorities, Hupfield, Schrader, Nicolas; Vaihinger and Dillman will be of assistance to one who holds to five; Noeldeke and Knobel are authorities in favour of six or seven authors. If, however, any person has convinced himself that there are an indefinite number of authors, he has Ewald on his side. Moreover, authorities will not fail the student, if he assert that the Pentateuch was completed in the time of Josue (Delitzsch, Kurtz), or of Saul (Staehelin), or of David (Bleek), or of Solomon (Tuch), or of Josias (Knobel), or in the last year before the Babylonian captivity (Schrader), or in the time of Esdras (Wellhausen), or during the interval between Nehemias and Alexander the Great (Reuss), or in the days of the first Ptolemys, when the Alexandrine version was made (Delitzsch), or at the time of the Machabees (Seinecke). Furthermore, he has no reason to be afraid of going wrong in assigning different passages and verses to different authors; for whether he decides upon attributing a given passage or verse to the Elohist or Jahvist, he will not be without authorities: *e.g.*, Gen. vi. 1-8, is attributed by Hupfield to the Jahvist; by Schrader partly to the theocratic, partly to the prophetic writer; by Delitzsch to a writer who is neither Elohist nor Jahvist: Gen. vii. 23, is attributed to the Elohist by Tuch, Staehelin, Delitzsch; one half of the verse only is assigned to the Elohist by Dillman; the whole verse is attributed to the Jahvist by Noeldeke and Wellhausen, to the prophetic writer by Schrader: Gen. xlix. is ascribed to the Elohist by Tuch and Ewald, to the Jahvist by Hupfield, to the prophetic writer by Schrader, &c. Finally, should he, in regard to a verse, be perplexed as to the writer to whom he ought to refer it, he will be able to avail himself of the new expressions of modern critical science to conceal an arbitrary unsupported judgment. In such cases he can assert that the Jahvist ‘has carefully imitated,’ or ‘partially followed,’ the Elohist; or that ‘he has built up his edifice upon an Elohistic foundation;’ or that ‘he has employed an Elohistic colouring;’ or that ‘he has introduced Elohistic phrases,’ or that ‘he has retained an Elohistic footnote or marginal note,’ &c.”

¹ Cornely, vol. ii., page 31.

A word, in conclusion, as to the later kings of Juda. Ezechias is acknowledged by M. *Rénan* to have been a great king.¹ During his reign took place the invasion and complete defeat of the Assyrian monarch Sennacherib.² Manasses, who reigned from 696 to 641, we know to have been a wicked prince. M. *Rénan*, however, asserts that his conduct differed in nothing from that of his father;³ his reign, according to him, was very prosperous⁴ and very long. As to his captivity and repentance, he says, "what we read in the books of Chronicles of a pretended captivity of Manasses in Assyria is only a fable." This too, notwithstanding the confirmation of the books of Chronicles supplied by recent discoveries among the cuneiform inscriptions! Of Josias, who was a good and pious prince, M. *Rénan* says that he was entirely in the hands of the priests.

Meanwhile Ninive was destroyed, and the Assyrian empire came to an end in the year 625 B.C., according to the prophecy of Nahum, delivered one hundred and twenty-five years before. Babylon now became the centre of power in the east, and the Babylonian empire became the great danger for Juda. In the year 605, Nabuchodonosor made his appearance, as M. *Rénan* expresses it, "upon the stage of the world." Jeremias was at that time the moving power in Jerusalem, and he warned the people that punishment was at hand because of their sins. Once, in the reign of Joachim, Nabuchodonosor appeared in the holy city; but he was merciful, and permitted the king to retain his throne.⁵ Disunion, however, prevailed in Sion, and a revolt took place against Babylon. Vengeance was at hand, for the Babylonian monarch once more turned his arms against the kingdom of Juda. Town after town fell before him, and last of all, in 598, fell Jerusalem itself; the people were carried into captivity. For a few brief years, Sedecias, a nominee of Nabuchodonosor, sat upon the throne of Juda; and with him ended the long line of kings descended from David.

¹ Vol. iii., page 3. ² Vol. iii., page 92. ³ Vol. iii., page 122.

⁴ Vol. iii., page 144.

⁵ Vol. iii., page 297.

Yet not ended! for the prophecies of Isaiah have been fulfilled; amongst others that one¹ which tells of the Child that shall sit upon the throne of David for ever. "Perhaps," says M. Rénan of that divine prophecy, "it is the image of an ideal king, such as a Jahveist might have dreamed him to be, which came to console the imagination of the afflicted prophet." A lame explanation, surely! But a fair specimen of M. Rénan's style of prophetic interpretation. An image of an ideal king, indeed, the prophet was favoured with—the Son of God, who has established for ever the kingdom of peace and justice, who has prolonged the house of David to eternity.

J. A. HOWLETT.

IRISH PARLIAMENTS.—II.

WHEN King James I. ascended the throne² several arbitrary attempts were made to coerce the Catholics³ and the Puritans, as also to restrict the privileges and liberties of the Irish parliament. The chief agents in these transactions were Sir Arthur Chichester, Lord-Deputy; Sir John Davis, Attorney-General; and Sir Oliver St. John, Lord-Deputy. In the beginning of this reign, the Irish Catholics had hoped for toleration in the public exercise of their worship. Instead of this, however, several royal proclamations and several enactments were framed and executed against them with vigour.⁴ Those who refused to attend Protestant services were heavily fined, and they were stigmatized with

¹ Is. ix. 6, 7.

² He reigned from the 24th of March, 1603, to the 27th of March, 1625.

³ See Bishop Rothe's *Analecta Sacra Nova et Mira de Rebus Catholicorum in Hibernia*, published at Cologne, 1617. New edition, by Right Rev. Patrick F. Moran, Bishop of Ossory; Dublin, 1884, 8vo.

⁴ See *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Ireland, of the Reign of James I., 1603-1606*, edited by C. W. Russell, D.D., and John P. Prendergast, Esq., page 301, *et seq.*

the epithet of Recusants.¹ On the 20th of February, 1604, Sir John Davis wrote to Cecil from Castle Reban, county of Kildare, regarding the many abuses existing in Ireland, which had now been completely subdued by force of arms ; and, alluding to the parliament which he shortly expected to be summoned there he states, that a copy of Poynings' Act—which directed the manner of holding the parliament in that kingdom—had been forwarded to their lordships of the English Privy Council, together with all the other Acts which had either superseded or expounded that law. This he declared had been done, because he guessed that it was likely to be a matter for deliberation and counsel among them at that time. He wished, also, that the Privy Council at Dublin had instructions to consider what Acts were fit to be passed and to be agreed upon before that year had too far advanced.² With this letter various enclosures of documents were sent.³

An interval of twenty-seven years had elapsed since the last legislative assembly met. The most unconstitutional methods had been adopted⁴ to secure a preponderance for the Court party, when a parliament was

¹ In his speech as Attorney-General prosecuting some of them before the Irish Star Chamber Council in Dublin Castle, Sir John Davis lays down the monstrous doctrine, that the king was supreme in all matters ecclesiastical, and that it was not for subjects to question the prerogative royal in matters of government. The substance of this speech is contained in the *Carte Papers*, vol. lxi., page 117.

² According to the *State Papers of Ireland*, vol. ccxvi., 4.

³ Among these are Sir Edward Poynings' Act of 10 Henry VII., cap. 4 ; another Act of 28 King Henry VIII., cap. 4 ; the Repeal of Poynings Act, under Leonard Graie, Lord-Deputy ; an Act of 4th Mary, cap. 4, declaring how Poynings' Act shall be expounded, under Thomas, Earl of Sussex ; Lord Deputy ; an Act of 11th Elizabeth, cap. 1., authorizing statutes, ordinances, and provisions to be made in this present parliament concerning the government of the common weal, and the augmentation of her Majesty's revenues, notwithstanding Poynings' Act, under Sir Henry Sydney, knight, Lord-Deputy ; as also an Act of the same year, cap. 8, and intituled, An Act that there be no bill certified into England for the repeal or suspending of the Statute passed in Poynings' time before the same bill be first agreed on in a session of parliament holden in this realm, by the great number of the lords and commons.

⁴ Some curious particulars relating to the election of members and a Speaker for this parliament may be found in the Patent Roll of Chancery, 16 Jac. 1, page 3.

summoned to meet at Dublin in 1613.¹ After some very disreputable scenes had been witnessed within the house, Sir John Davis was forcibly placed as speaker in the chair.² Then the Recusants indignantly retired from both houses. On the 21st of May, he delivered a very plausible speech in the higher house, when the Lord-Deputy Chichester had approved his election. This speech is filled with fulsome flattery of the king and his deputy, as also with varied historic misrepresentation³ in his political view of the situation.

In 1621, Sir Richard Bolton⁴ collected the statutes of the Irish parliaments into one folio volume, which was printed by the society of stationers, who were then printers to his Majesty. The work furnishes an idea of the legislation that prevailed in Ireland previous to that date. At a later period, he was Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and author of *A Declaration setting forth How and by What Means the Laws and Statutes of England, from Time to Time, came to be of Force in Ireland*.⁵

¹ In a manuscript belonging to Trinity College Library, and classed F. 3. 17, a list of the members composing it may be found, as also the sums paid by their constituents to several of them for their attendance: viz., 13s. 4d. per diem to a knight; 10s. to a citizen, and 6s. 8d. to a burgess.

² From 1613 to 1800, we have a record of Irish Parliamentary proceedings in "The Journals of the House of Commons of the Kingdom of Ireland," in thirty-eight fine folio volumes; with two thick folio volumes of a general index. Dublin: Printed by George Grierson, Printer to the King's most excellent Majesty. 1796 to 1802.

³ It may be read in Rev. Dr. Leland's *History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II.* Appendix, pp. 489-501, with the writer's notes on it, succeeding.

⁴ He became Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and afterwards he was Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

⁵ This tract was first printed in Walter Harris's *Hibernica*, part ii., pp. 9-45. Although Harris states that the name of Sir Richard Bolton appears on a copy of the manuscript, yet is he inclined, but without any good reason for his opinion, "rather to give the honour of the performance to Patrick Darcy, Esq., an eminent lawyer, and an active member of the House of Commons in the parliament assembled in Dublin, in 1640, when the Papists had a share in the Legislature as well as the Protestants." However, he subsequently publishes Serjeant Mayart's *Answer to a Book entitled, A Declaration setting forth How and by What Means the Laws and Statutes of England, from Time to Time, came to be in Force in Ireland*, written by Sir Richard Bolton. See *ibid.*, pp. 47-231. The question of authorship seems to be settled in the opening sentence of Mayart, where he refers to "that book by the Lord Chancellor."

The reign of Charles I.¹ over Ireland was signalized by the tyrannical and arbitrary government of Viscount Wentworth, afterwards the unfortunate Earl of Strafford. His leading objects seem to have been the destruction of parliamentary independence, the procuring of subsidies for the king, and his abominable inquisition, to ensure the forfeiture of Irish estates, so that he might bestow them on his relations or partisans.² The encroachments on popular rights led to a confederacy of the Catholic with the Puritan members of parliament to resist; while remonstrances were addressed to the king. Afterwards, some concessions were obtained. However, the king would not consent that any part of Poynings' law should be repealed. The constitutional rights of Irish subjects were still insisted upon with great spirit. The Irish House of Commons appointed a prolocutor, Sir Patrick Darcy,³ at a conference with the Lords, to assert their case and requirements. That *Argument delivered by Patrick Darcy, Esquire; by the express Order of the House of Commons in the Parliament of Ireland, 9, Junii, 1641*, was printed by Thomas Bourke, printer to the Confederate Catholicks of Ireland, in 1643.⁴ All irregular or illegal practices and usurpations of public privileges were then condemned by the Irish House of Commons, while the liberties of Irish subjects were solemnly affirmed with strength and precision. The incidents of a prolonged war waged by the Irish Confederate Catholics against their

¹ He was king from the 27th of March, A.D. 1625, to the 30th of January, 1649, when he was beheaded.

² See *Ireland's Case briefly Stated; or a Summary Account of the Most Remarkable Transactions in that Kingdom since the Reformation*. By a true Lover of his King and Country, part i., pp. 18, 19. Printed in the year 1720, 18mo.

³ Thomas Moore, misconceiving Harris's negative doubt, has committed an extraordinary historical blunder in making Sir Patrick Darcy assume the name of Sir Richard Bolton. See *History of Ireland*, vol. ii., chap. xxxii., page 329, note.

⁴ This work was reprinted in Dublin by G. F. in 1764, and issued as a thin 12mo. volume, pp. 1-149. To this tract has been added the speech of Mr. Audley Mervin upon the Impeachment of Sir Richard Bolton, &c., March 4th, 1640. The latter is likewise a Dublin reprint, dated the same year, and by the same publisher; the paging being continued to page 176.

English rulers followed,¹ and almost put an end to further parliamentary proceedings during the rest of this reign.² The deposition of Charles I. by the Long Parliament in England, his trial, and subsequent execution, changed the whole character of the constitution there, and the monarchical form of government was abolished, a republican or popular representation having been instituted.

Early in the year 1649, the House of Peers was abolished, and in the lower house it was voted that the supreme national authority was vested in the representatives of the people. Still was the name of parliament maintained, while a radical revolution had been effected. A council of state, consisting of forty-one members, was selected for the purposes of general administration, but with powers limited in duration to twelve months. Three-fourths of the numbers selected had seats in the house. Notwithstanding the discontent of the royalist party, and their armed resistance in Ireland and in Scotland, the newly constituted government, with the aid of a large military and naval force, maintained tranquillity at home and prestige abroad, until the ambition of Oliver Cromwell, no less distinguished as an astute and intriguing politician than as a vigorous general, urged him violently to dissolve the parliament in 1653. This was succeeded by an assembly of the saints or godly persons, selected by the council in the presence of the lord-general, and consisting of one hundred and thirty-nine representatives for England, six for Wales, six for Ireland, and five for Scotland.³ This farce was soon played out, however, when Cromwell deemed it time to assume the rôle of Lord Protector, and vested with supreme power of his own conferring.

No parliament was held in Ireland during the time of

¹ See John T. Gilbert's *Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641-1652, now for the first Time published*. With an Appendix of original Letters and Documents, three volumes, Dublin, 1879-1880, 4to.

² The fullest account of this civil war may be found in John T. Gilbert's *History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, 1641-1643*. Two volumes, Dublin, 1882, 4to; continued in vol. iii., from 1643-1644, Dublin, 1885, 4to; vol. iv., from 1644-1645, Dublin, 1888, 4to; vol. v., from 1645-1646, Dublin, 1889, 4to; vol. vi., from 1646-1648, Dublin, 1890, 4to; vol. vii., from 1646-1649, Dublin, 1891, 4to.

³ See Rev. Dr. Lingard's *History of England*, vol. xi., chap. i., page 4.

the English Commonwealth¹ and the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell.² Even in England the journalistic proceedings of parliament are wanting for that period; while there is a chasm in the acts, books and documents of parliament, from 1648 to 1660.³

From the thirteenth to the eighteenth of King Charles II.⁴ only one parliament, and that prorogued several times, was held in Ireland. Overridden and supervised as its proceedings were by the English Government and Parliament, their navigation laws and restrictions on Irish trade and commerce crippled all serious attempts to revive national industry or prosperity.⁵ In 1678, those Irish statutes previously issued by Sir Richard Bolton were reprinted by Benjamin Tooke, with the addition of subsequent acts to the session of the 17th and 18th of King Charles II. inclusive.⁶ This forms the best record

¹ This interregnum continued from the 30th of January, 1649, to the 29th of May, 1660.

² "As to what was done for *Ireland* in the parliament of *England* in *Cromwell's* time, besides the confusion and irregularity of all proceeding in those days, which hinders any of them to be brought into precedent in these times, we shall find also that then there were *representatives* sent out of this kingdom, who sate in the parliament of *England*, which then was *only* the *House of Commons*. We cannot, therefore, argue from hence, that *England* may bind us; for we see they allowed us *representatives*, without which, they rightly concluded, they could not make laws *obligatory* to us."—William Molyneux's *Case of Ireland's being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, pp. 101, 102.

³ See *General Report to the King in Council from the Honourable Board of Commissioners on the Public Records*, page 76.

⁴ He began to reign *de facto*, from May 29th, 1660; but the judges absurdly ruled that he was king *de jure* and *de facto* from the death of his father; so that the first year of his restoration to the throne is called the twelfth of his reign. He died on the 6th of February, 1685.

⁵ See Rt. Hon. John Hely Hutchinson's *Commercial Restraints of Ireland Considered*. In a Series of Letters to a noble Lord containing an Historical Account of the Affairs of that Kingdom, as far as they relate to this subject. The first edition of this valuable work was printed without the author's name in Dublin, 1779, by William Hallhead, No. 63, Dame-street, with a Preface; it contains nine letters, pp. 1-240, 8vo. There are three tabular Appendices, in folding sheets, giving under several previous years—in No. I. The Wool and Worsted-yarn exported to England; in No. II., The Drapery; and in No. III., The Linen Cloth. This work has been re-edited, with a sketch of the Author's Life, Introduction, Notes, and Index, by Rev. William G. Carroll, M.A., and Rector of St. Bride's Church, Dublin. A portrait of the author and handwriting are also given. Dublin, 1882, 12mo.

⁶ To this impression was added a thin and an incomplete Index,

of Irish parliamentary history, for the reigns of King Charles I. and King Charles II.

From that time to the Revolution, no parliament was held in Ireland. King James II., who succeeded to the English throne on the death of his brother Charles II., only reigned over England for three years, being obliged to abdicate on the 11th of December, 1688. However, he was acknowledged as king over Ireland, and he came to it on the 12th of March, 1689. On the 7th of May in that year, James II. opened a parliament in Dublin.¹ But, its acts were afterwards declared void,² and they have been expunged from the Rolls. Not alone by Irish Catholics, but even by numbers of the Irish Protestants, and especially by the Episcopalians, was he regarded as king *de jure*, while they raised a large army to sustain his cause.³ After a war, which was maintained in his interests for more than two years, the power and authority of that monarch ceased in Ireland—especially with the surrender of Limerick, on the 3rd of October, 1691.⁴

One parliament was held in Ireland during the joint reigns of William III. and Mary,⁵ while two parliaments

¹ The names of the Lords and Commons constituting it are to be found in the Appendix No. xxxi., xxxii., to Walter Harris's *History of the Life and Reign of William Henry, Prince of Nassau and Orange, Stadtholder of the United Provinces, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, &c.* Dublin, 1749, fol.

² See William Molyneux's *Case of Ireland's being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, page 109.

³ See further details in John D'Alton's *Illustrations, Historical and Genealogical, of King James's Irish Army List* (1689). Dublin, 1885, 8vo.

⁴ The most interesting and circumstantial account of these events is that found in *Macariæ Excidium, or the Destruction of Cyprus; being a secret History of the War of the Revolution in Ireland*, by Colonel Charles O'Kelly, and as most learnedly and carefully edited for the Irish Archaeological Society by John Cornelius O'Callaghan, whose notes and illustrations appended form the chief value of that work, published in Dublin, 1850, 4to.

⁵ By Statute of 1 William and Mary, session 2, chap. 2, it is stated, that the 13th of February, 1688-89, was "the day on which their Majesties accepted the Crown and Royal dignity of King and Queen of England." Queen Mary died on the 28th of December, 1694. Then the regal style was altered, and William III. commenced his seventh regnal year. His sixth year terminated on the 27th of that month. See *Journals of the House of Lords*, vol. xv., pp. 451, 452.

were convened during the single reign of King William III.¹ The first serious effort to promote constitutional independence by the Irish Protestants—for the Catholics had been denied all political rights—took place in 1698, when William Molyneux published his celebrated treatise, the *Case of Ireland being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*. This created a great ferment in England, where it was deemed to be of dangerous tendency to the crown and people, while the representatives of both houses there specially recommended the king to maintain the legislative supremacy of the English over the Irish parliament.

Sessions of parliament took place in Ireland during the second, fourth, sixth, eighth, ninth, and tenth year of Queen Anne's reign.² During this period, and in the following reign, the public spirit and caustic writings of that incomparable genius, Dean Swift, had a powerful influence over the minds of English and Irish politicians. They effected a strong feeling in favour of promoting Irish trade and industry; while they roused a spirit of opposition to the domination of England, on matters affecting the interests of Ireland. Mean-time, penal enactments were intolerantly multiplied, by the members of our native parliament, on their proscribed fellow-countrymen who were Catholics.

Sessions of parliament were assembled in Ireland during the second, fourth, sixth, eighth, tenth, and twelfth year of the reign of George I.³ During this reign occurred the celebrated cause between Hester Sherlock and Maurice Annesley, before the Irish Court of Exchequer, which was reversed on an appeal to the Irish House of Lords. From this tribunal Annesley appealed to the English peers, who decided in his favour, and these assumed to rescind the Irish Lords' decree. An opinion of the Irish judges ruled that the Irish parliament only had legal jurisdiction in such

¹ He died on the 8th of March, 1702. The particulars of his career are fully set forth in Walter Harris's *History of the Life and Reign of William Henry, Prince of Nassau and Orange, Stadtholder of the United Provinces, King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, &c.*

² It began on the 8th of March, 1702, and it continued to August 1st, 1714.

³ It continued from August 1st, 1714, to the 11th June, 1727.

cases, and Sherlock was accordingly put into possession of the estate. This led to a conflict of jurisdiction, and English jealousy was so greatly excited, that an act was passed by the parliament, in which it was declared that the King, Lords and Commons had, hath, and ought to have, full power and authority to make laws which should bind the people of Ireland. It was also determined that the Irish House of Lords had no power or jurisdiction to affirm or reverse a sentence or decree of any court within the kingdom, while its judgments in such matters should be regarded as null and void.

In 1723, the collection of Irish statutes issued by Benjamin Tooke was reprinted, without any additions. Those Acts, which passed during the reigns of King William and of Queen Mary, with those of Queen Anne, and of the succeeding kings, had been printed by the king's printers, at the close of each respective session. They were issued in different volumes, of various sizes, and in different styles of type, without indexes, or any aid to find the contents, or even the titles, but by inspecting the volumes of those sessions, in which the several acts were passed.

During the reign of George II.,¹ sessions of parliament were held in Ireland, in the first, third, fifth, seventh, ninth, eleventh, thirteenth, fifteenth, seventeenth, nineteenth, twenty-first, twenty-third, twenty-fifth, twenty-seventh, twenty-ninth, thirtieth, thirty-first, and thirty-third years. The laws passed against the Irish Catholics were most proscriptive and abominable, while through the instrumentality of the Protestant Primate Boulter, court influence was exerted likewise, to enslave the northern Presbyterians, by means of tests, excluding them from official positions, and to extinguish generally all national aspirations or legislative independence. However, the celebrated Dr. Charles Lucas, in the Irish parliament and in the Dublin Corporation, strenuously opposed the government party. His advocacy of Irish rights and liberties even obliged him to fly from the country for a time, to avoid the prosecution and punishments destined for his patriotic exertions.

¹ From June 11th, 1727, to October 25th, 1760.

While the reign of George III.¹ lasted, Irish parliaments sat in the first, third, fifth, seventh, ninth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth, twenty-first and twenty-second, twenty-third and twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh, twenty-eighth, twenty-ninth, thirtieth, thirty-first, thirty-second, thirty-third, thirty-fourth, thirty-fifth, thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth, thirty-ninth, and fortieth years. Owing to the pensions paid from Irish revenues to unworthy placemen, the corrupting influences of the crown dominated the actions of parliament in the earlier years of this reign. However, the cause of reform, toleration, and constitutional rights began to make some progress.² The encroachments of the crown on the privileges of the Irish parliament were in some cases successfully resisted; while the spirit of liberty awakened by the American Revolution, and the formation of volunteers gave the Irish people and their representatives courage and resolution to demand a free trade, the Catholics obtaining likewise some concessions, which extended their social if not their political influence and comforts.

The volumes of Irish Acts of Parliament accumulating during the previous reigns, were found to have become so numerous, that they were unsuited for convenient use. Moreover, they became so dispersed, that it was difficult to obtain complete sets to answer the purposes of justice, especially at the assizes held in the various Irish counties. Therefore the House of Lords passed a resolution, on the 20th of April, 1762: "That the statutes at large of this Kingdom be forthwith printed and published under the inspection of the Lord Chancellor and Judges; and as an encouragement to the printer, a copy thereof be given to each member of both houses of Parliament."³

¹ From October 25th, 1760, to the 29th of January, 1820.

² See Francis Hardy's *Memoirs of the political and private Life of James Caulfield, Earl of Charlemont*, vol. i., London, 1812, 8vo.

³ In consequence of this, his Excellency the Earl of Halifax, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, on the 27th of April, 1762, directed Hugh Boulter Primrose Grierson to print and publish those statutes, as ordered. A fine folio edition in several volumes was issued in consequence, and it is the only approximately complete collection of Irish Statutes we now possess.

The illustrious Henry Grattan, inspired by the citizen soldiery and by the almost unanimous voice of the Irish people, obtained a free trade for Ireland and the removal of commercial restrictions, in 1779. On the 19th of April, 1780, he moved a resolution also in the Irish House of Commons, that no power on earth, save that of the kings, lords, and commons, had a right to make laws for Ireland.¹ It was not then pressed to a division; but soon the tide of popular opinion, and the crisis produced by the state of affairs abroad, bore it onward in triumph. Accordingly, on the 16th of April, 1782, after a splendid oration, he moved a Declaration of Irish Rights, which was carried without a dissentient voice, and the British Parliament deemed it politic to assent. An Act was then passed, to repeal the statute of George I., for better securing the dependence of Ireland on the crown of Great Britain. The progressive prosperity of Ireland—agricultural, mechanical, and commercial—soon became manifest, under the fostering care of a native and unfettered parliament.

The wily machinations of William Pitt, who especially hated Ireland, aided by his subservient creatures in the Irish administration, began the realization of a long-formed project for extinguishing the legislature, and the right of Ireland to self-government. His tortuous and malign policy was exerted to undermine the fabric of independence already reared; to introduce insidious commercial propositions restricting trade enterprise; to disappoint the hopes of the Irish Catholics for Emancipation; to adopt arbitrary and atrocious measures, executed by unprincipled and corrupt officials, charged with absolute and despotic governmental powers. These proceedings fostered party spirit, and led to a sanguinary rebellion in 1798. Through the most unscrupulous of instruments, Lords Clare and Castlereagh, and through the most shameless corruption, that measure for a legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland came before both of their parliaments in 1799.² This motion was

¹ See *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Rt. Hon. Henry Grattan*, by his son, Henry Grattan, Esq., M.P., vol. ii., chap. ii., page 48.

² See Sir Charles Coote's *History of the Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland*, chaps. i., ii. London, 1802, 8vo.

defeated by a narrow majority in the Irish House of Commons, and it had to be abandoned for that session.¹

However, having effectively exercised the powers of bribery and cajolery among the venal representatives who were gained over during the recess, that measure was again prepared; yet, veiled under a vague speech from the throne, on the 15th January, 1800, and in which no allusion was made to the government project. But when an amendment, affirming a resolution to maintain the Constitution of 1782, as also to support the national freedom and independence, was defeated, Lord Castlereagh, the Irish Secretary, finding his efforts had now secured the object in view, pressed the measure of legislative union to its final and disastrous issue. It passed both houses in the course of that year.

The vastly greater majority of the Irish people—while among these are particularly included Protestants and even Orangemen—were united in opposition to the extinction of their native parliament. However, when they attempted to give public and constitutional expression to their protests, meetings were almost everywhere suppressed by the arbitrary government of the time. Terrorism and deception were alternately and simultaneously employed to silence opposition or agitation from without. Corruption and seduction were shamelessly tried within the Houses of Lords and Commons, already filled with placemen, pensioners and traders in the sale of boroughs. After some adjustments in the British and Irish Parliaments, the Act of a Legislative Union and its articles of a treaty, were proclaimed to the Irish nation, on the 1st day of January, 1801.

Robbed of their rights, which the people had neither the will nor the power to surrender, never from that time to the present have the Irish ratified or acquiesced in the measure for an incorporating union. On the contrary, their protests, complaints, and agitations are on record, every year since the

¹ The series of transactions by which this measure was carried is admirably set forth in Sir Jonah Barrington's *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*. Paris, 1833, 8vo.

commencement of this century, and daily are they growing in intensity and impatience. The people well understand that the Act of Union has not conferred a single direct benefit, while it has inflicted innumerable evils upon Ireland. Nor has subsequent beneficial legislation been a consequence; while it has even weakened the power and resources of England, by yearly decreasing the prosperity of our impoverished country. It has driven millions of the Irish race into distant countries, to gain that subsistence abroad which has been denied them at home, with bitter memories of the national injury perpetrated, and to be imparted even to their posterity. Public opinion—which is only another expression for the public conscience—imperatively demands a restitution in full measure for the gross injustice perpetrated, and the rights which have been subjected to such shameful violation. The power to frame constitutions and laws for their own just government is inherent in all distinct nationalities, and required for all civilized people; while to that consideration the mind of every enlightened person in the empire—and especially in Ireland—is now directed, with a view to provide the remedy, and to reconstruct on a surer basis the framework of a national government, by amply securing the equal rights and liberties of each individual under its jurisdiction, without distinction of class; of party, or of creed.

JOHN CANON O'HANLON.

MUSICAL TEMPERAMENT.

THERE has been a general tendency in physical science, for many years past, to regard as energy or forms of motion what were once considered to be different kinds of matter. If we except electricity and magnetism, which are still in a state of transition, the "imponderables" have almost disappeared from our text-books; and when "caloric" and "luminiferous particles" are referred to, it is only

because of the historical interest they possess from the great names with which they are ordinarily associated. The striking analogy which exists between some of the phenomena of sound and certain phenomena of light and heat has contributed largely to this result; for, from the time of Aristotle, at least, it appears never to have been seriously questioned that sound is due to vibratory motion. Even he abandoned his favourite "matter and form," which served to account for nearly everything else, and regarded sound as taking place when bodies strike the air, "not from the air having a form impressed on it, but by its being moved in a corresponding manner;"¹ and, three centuries later, Vitruvius explained the nature of sound and the mode of its transmission with an aptness of illustration which could hardly be excelled.

"Voice [said the great architect] is breath flowing and made sensible to the hearing by striking the air. It moves in infinite circumferences of circles, as when, by throwing a stone into still water, you produce innumerable circles of waves, increasing from the centre and spreading outwards, till the boundary of the space or some obstacle prevents their outlines from going further. In the same manner the voice makes its motion in circles. But in water the circle moves breathwise upon a level plane; the voice proceeds in breadth and also successively ascends in height."²

To make this illustration nearly perfect, we have only to conceive the crests of all the waves as pressed down to the original level, without the water particles receiving any lateral displacement, and the hollows as similarly pressed up; there is thus produced a series of concentric strata, alternately condensed and rarefied; and if we suppose the disturbance to originate in the body of the fluid, these strata become the surfaces of concentric spheres; or, rather, they become hollow spherical shells, having the point of disturbance as their common centre. When a bell or other sounding body vibrates in air, it produces a series of undulations or waves, each consisting of a condensed and a rarefied part, as in the case we have supposed of water. The air particles themselves make little excursions to and fro; but

¹ *Fragmentum de audibilibus.*

² *De architect.*

the waves are transmitted onwards, in some cases to very great distances. On reaching the ear these waves are conveyed through the aural passage to the tympanic membrane by which this passage is closed; and from it they are sent through a series of bones to the inner labyrinth of the ear, where the filaments of the auditory nerve are spread out to receive and transmit them to the brain.

The average human ear is capable of appreciating as sound rates of vibration which range from about fifteen or twenty in a second to nearly forty thousand. For the purposes of music, however, the vibration rates practically employed lie within narrower limits. The lowest note of our largest organs is usually produced by a little under twenty vibrations in a second; and the lowest on most pianos is given by nearly thirty. But these are sounds which if heard by themselves can hardly be called musical. The ear readily detects in them a want of uniformity which prevents such sounds being used except in combination with others to which they impart firmness and solidity.

The highest notes ordinarily employed in the orchestra are produced by the piccolo; and the greatest vibration rate seldom exceeds four thousand in a second. One sometimes hears, no doubt, attempts at music much beyond this limit; and even at so high a pitch, the hands of a Paganini, when circumstances favour, may elicit from a good Cremona tolerable results. But, as a rule, such efforts, when not a positive torture, excite in the listener wonder at the performer's skill rather than admiration of the beauty of his melody.

Two sounds when heard simultaneously produce, as is known, in some cases an agreeable, in others a disagreeable sensation. A note and its octave, for instance, are pleasing. So are a note and its fifth. But no ear will tolerate long two sounds which differ in pitch by a tone; and still less if they differ only by a semitone. How does it happen, then, that the ear is pleased with some combinations, and not with others? The physicists and musicians of the last century answered this question nearly as Pythagoras did—"because the human mind takes a constitutional delight in simple

numerical relations." In his experiments with vibrating strings, Pythagoras had found that when a string stretched between two fixed supports was divided by means of a movable bridge, the parts of it which gave a note and its octave were related as $2 : 1$. Adjusting the bridge so as to produce a note and its fifth, the lengths of the parts were found to be as $3 : 2$. And, in general, it is true that the simpler the ratio of the parts, the more perfect the consonance. But when the ratio can be expressed only by fractions or large whole numbers, experiment shows that the result is dissonance. With the vibration rates corresponding to any given interval, Pythagoras and his followers were wholly unacquainted. The laws of a vibrating string were but imperfectly known before the time of Euler; and it is only within recent years that the origin of consonance and dissonance has found its full explanation.

There is a well-known experiment in optics in which two rays of coloured light are so combined as to produce darkness; and acoustics furnishes a corresponding experiment in which two sounds are made to produce silence. Both phenomena are comprised under the general name of *interference*. Two tuning-forks, F and F_1 , which give notes of nearly the same pitch, will serve for illustration. And let us assume, for greater simplicity, that, in a second, F produces 100 complete vibrations, and that F_1 produces 101. If both forks commence together with a condensed wave, they will finish together with a rarefied wave. At the beginning and end of the first second, therefore, a sound is heard of greater intensity than that produced by either singly. But what is the condition of things at the end of the first half second? The fork F has just finished its fiftieth vibration with a rarefied wave, whereas F_1 has just finished the first or condensed half of its fifty-first vibration. As the rarefied wave of F and the condensed wave of F_1 reach the ear together, they neutralize each other in the aural cavity; and the resulting sensation is a momentary silence. The same conditions recurring each subsequent second, instead of a uniform flow of sound, the impression of an intermittent or throbbing motion is produced; and when the sounds are

loud enough, and the interferences frequent, the sensation of a drum-roll in miniature—technically called *beats*—is experienced.

Let us now suppose that there are two organ pipes— P and P_1 —in every respect alike, except that P_1 is provided with a sliding tube by means of which its length can be increased at pleasure. When the pipes are sounded together, and the lengths equal, the unison is perfect. But when P_1 is made ever so little longer than P , immediately slow beats are heard. As the length of P_1 increases, the frequency of the beats increases also; and, finally, a point is reached at which no ear can bear the dissonance. On further increasing the length of P_1 , the harshness gradually diminishes; and when the interval between the notes has reached a certain limit, although the presence of beats may still be recognised, but little of their dissonant effect remains. Helmholtz, to whom most of our experiments in this subject are due, has found that for sounds of nearly the same pitch as the middle notes of the piano, the dissonance is greatest when the beats occur from twenty to forty in a second.

If the beats are slow enough to be easily counted, the uniform flow of sound, although somewhat impeded, is not disturbed to such an extent as to acquire a distinctly dissonant character; and in slow impressive musical passages, beats may even serve to heighten the emotional effect. The *Voix Celeste* stop of many organs and harmoniums is constructed on this principle. Two ranks of pipes or reeds, differing only in having the pipes in one rank tuned a shade higher than the corresponding pipes of the other, are so arranged that when a key is pressed down, two notes giving slow beats are produced simultaneously. The fluctuating sound thus caused, if accompanied by a barely audible bass and used sparingly, is pleasing and even devotional.

There is another way in which roughness in the combined effect of different sounds frequently arises. It is well-known that when a body vibrates, not one, but a number of sounds are produced. The lowest of these is called the *fundamental* note; the others are called *harmonics* or *partial* tones. As a rule, the partials are feeble, compared with the

fundamental note ; but they are not always so. The loudest sound of an ordinary bell, for instance, is, in reality, a partial tone. Standing in a tower where a bell is tolling, one easily hears the fundamental note, and a great variety of other much higher sounds besides. Of these, some are consonant, others dissonant with the proper note of the bell ; and it is the aim of the bell-founder to strengthen one set and weaken the other as much as he can. But, as uniform elasticity and density are practically unattainable, except by accident, it rarely happens that the vibration rates of the different segments are exactly equal ; and hence arise those powerful beats which, in the case of very large bells, sometimes seem as if they would shake the very walls asunder.

Strings, organ pipes, and most other sounding bodies also produce partial tones ; being usually concealed by the much louder fundamental note, however, great attention and a practised ear are required in examining them. The pitch of the note which a stretched string or wire emits is the same at whatever point in its length it is plucked with the fingers or rubbed with a violin bow ; but the least educated ear easily detects a difference in the quality of the sound. If plucked near one end, the character of the note is richer and more penetrating than if plucked at the middle point—a difference due to the presence of concordant partials in the former case which are absent in the latter. Notes of the same pitch produced by open and closed organ pipes also differ widely in character, and for the same reason. Stretched strings and columns of air possess the remarkable property that, while vibrating as a whole, they are capable of subdividing to an almost unlimited extent into small independent vibrating segments. It is these which give rise to the partial tones.

Taking the simplest case of a vibrating string, experiment shows that its segments are separated from each other by points, called *nodes* ; which, although partaking in the general motion of the string, yet, relatively to the segments, are stationary. The number of these nodes may be one or several. When there is only one, it is found at the middle point ; and the fundamental note is accompanied by another,

which is an octave higher. But when a string is plucked at the middle point, this sound is absent; for it cannot exist without a node there. And utilizing this principle, the pianoforte-maker is enabled to eliminate some of the discordant partial tones from the sound of his instrument. He needs only so to place the hammer that it strikes the wire where these partials require a node. The harpist, adopting a converse process, elicits notes of surprising sweetness by gently pressing the soft fleshy part of the palm of his hand against the centres of the strings which he plucks with his two first fingers and thumb. In the production of partial tones, the violin player, too, displays the perfection of his art. The same instrument in different hands, as is known, gives utterance to a different language. The part of the string rubbed, the pressure of the bow, the duration of contact, all contribute their share; but no code of rules is adequate, nor practice long enough, unless the inspiration of genius also guides the arm and finger.

Now let us suppose that a note and its octave are sounded together. Not only are the two fundamental notes consonant, but, in the case of strings, open organ pipes, and many wind instruments following the same law, the first five partial tones are consonant also. Calling the lower fundamental note c , its partials in ascending order are—

$$c_1, g_1, c_2, e_2, g_2, \dots ;$$

and the second fundamental note and its partials will be represented by a similar series, only an octave higher. In both cases a slight dissonance arises from the sixth partial, or that whose vibration rate is seven times the vibration rate of the fundamental; and the same is true of the eighth, and others still higher. But, usually partial tones become feeble in proportion as they rise in pitch; and in most instruments the discordant partials, when not eliminated by special contrivances, as in the piano, are masked not merely by the fundamental note, but also by the lower and much louder concordant partial tones.

Again, let a note and its fifth sound together. When the interval is perfect, the vibration rates are related as 2 : 3 ;

and, next to the octave, this is the most pleasing consonance. Taking c as the lower fundamental note, there is the same series of partials as before. The second fundamental note and its partials are in like manner—

$$g, g_1, d_2, g_2, b_2, d_3, \dots ;$$

and of these, g, g_1 , and g_2 , are consonant with $c, c_1, g_1, c_2, e_2, g_2, \dots$ in the first series. But d_2 beats with c_2 and e_2 ; b_2 beats with c_3 ; and so of others. If, however, the pitch of c be not lower than that of the middle c of the piano, or about 264 vibrations in a second, the dissonant effect of these beats is inappreciable. The number of beats produced by c_2 and d_2 , for instance, exceeds 130 in a second; and here the ear's capacity to distinguish beats is near its limit. But when c is one or more octaves lower, the beats arising from these partials being proportionately diminished, their disturbing effect, although not sufficient to destroy the consonance, nevertheless is distinctly felt.

It follows, therefore, that even the octave and fifth—the two most perfect consonances in the musical scale—contain within them some elements of dissonance. In the fourth, major third, and other intervals commonly regarded as consonant, the number of these elements increases; and some there are which puzzle even the sharpest ear to determine whether consonance or dissonance predominates.

The difficulty is increased in another way; for two notes of different pitch, however simple in themselves, when sounded together, if loud enough, produce by their union a third whose rate of vibration is always the *difference* of those of the generating notes. Two loud-speaking organ pipes, c and e , for instance, when sounded together, if the interval is perfect, have the second octave of c as an accompanying bass; and so of others. The sounds thus produced are known as *resultant* tones. They are also sometimes called Tartini's tones, from having been first used by that famous music-master in teaching his pupils to tune their violins.

The strings of the violin, as is known, are tuned in perfect fifths; and the vibration rates, therefore, of two adjacent open strings are as 2 : 3. The difference of these

numbers being unity, the resultant note is just an octave below the lower of the two generating notes; and as the interval of an octave is, next to unison, the easiest to recognise; hence Tartini's rule "to regard the tuning as perfect only when the resultant tone in each case is heard as the octave of the lower note, produced by bowing each pair of open strings in succession."

But it is in chords of three or more simultaneous sounds that the influence of resultant tones is mainly felt. Every ear detects at once a difference of character in chords, such as c-e-g and a-c-e. The major triad is clear, precise, decided; the minor is cloudy, vague, ambiguous. And the difference is more marked in proportion as the intervals are more perfect. These intervals are—a major third, a minor third, and a fifth. But as both chords consist of the same elementary intervals, and differ only in the arrangement of the thirds, the question arises—whence comes the difference in the impressions they produce? The answer is found on examining the relations in which the resultant tones stand in reference to the chord. In the major triad, the vibration rates of the three notes are related as the numbers 4 : 5 : 6. Hence the vibration rate of the resultant tone of c and e is expressed by unity; or, the resultant is the second lower octave of c, and belongs, therefore, to the chord. The notes e and g have a resultant, which is also the second lower octave of c; and for a like reason. The vibration rate of the resultant of c and g is expressed by 2, or the note is the first lower octave of c, and belongs also to the chord. Thus all the resultant tones, by adding depth and firmness to the root or fundamental note, strengthen and emphasize its effect.

But with the minor chord the case is different. The vibration rates of a, c, and e, for instance, are as the numbers 10 : 12 : 15. The resultant tones of a and e, and of c and e, belong to the chord. But the resultant of a and c is F₂—below the second lower octave of c—a note which is foreign to the chord. And it is to the struggle of this resultant tone to assert its individuality that the obscurity and indefiniteness of the minor triad is largely due. The ear is in doubt as to whether a minor chord a-c-e, or a major chord F₂-a-c, is

principally intended; and the dissonance arising from F_2 and e increases its perplexity.

Practical musicians were well acquainted with this defect of the minor chord long before the cause of it was fully understood. A well-constructed musical composition, like a well-arranged sermon, requires a peroration. Its several divisions, too, should be equally distinct. The cadence and final chord, where finality is intended, should suggest to the mind of the listener a feeling of completion, contentment, and repose. The minor chord, from its inherent restlessness, is ill-suited for such purpose; and up to the beginning of the last century, even where minor chords largely predominated, musical composers seldom employed it in a close. As a delicate shading between the confused, oppressive gloom of absolute dissonance and the clear inspiring glow of the major chord, it suited its purpose admirably; but when heard in its fulness, the sensitive ears of three hundred years ago always expected something to follow it. Musical taste has greatly changed since then; and whether we call it deterioration or improvement, the requirements of the modern ear are widely different from those of one equally tutored in the age of Palestrina. Many rules of grammar, once deemed sacred, had to be abandoned to attain the vehement *expression* and violent *contrasts* which characterize the free chromatic style of the present day; and, undoubtedly, to an ear fatigued by the almost incessant din of interminable discords—mostly unprepared—even the minor chord, notwithstanding its defects, sometimes affords a welcome rest.

The works of the great masters are an interesting study in the use of the minor chord in a close. Some of the composers seem to have anticipated instinctively the results which science has since obtained. Taking, for illustration, the vocal score of "The Messiah"—the best known of Handel's oratorios—we find, that of the twenty-four choral numbers which it contains, seven are in minor keys—two others being, in part, also minor. But of these nine numbers, only two end with the full minor chord—the words, in both cases, no less than the music, indicating that something further is to follow. Four of the numbers modulate in the last few

bars into major keys. In one, the disturbing effect of the minor third is eliminated by omitting the note altogether; and nearly the same result is obtained in the two remaining numbers by concentrating the soprano, alto, and bass voices on the key note and its octave, the third being sung only by the tenors.

The treatment of the major keys is very different. Each of the fifteen numbers devoted to them closes with the full major chord.

But it is rarely that we hear nowadays either a major or a minor chord in its purity. The special characteristics of each of them, although not quite obliterated, are greatly impaired by the coarse method of tuning adopted in modern keyed instruments. One has only to listen, however, to a stringed quartet played by four competent performers, or a good piece of harmony sung by voices trained without instrumental accompaniment, to be convinced what a vast difference of character there is in reality between them.

The reader, it is assumed, already knows that the graduated succession of sounds which we call the Natural Diatonic Scale, and which all civilized nations at the present day have adopted as the basis of their musical system, is not identical with the scale practically employed in the construction of keyed or fixed-toned instruments. Between adjacent notes in the Natural Scale there are three kinds of interval: c-d, f-g, and a-b, are called *major tones*; d-e, and g-a, are *minor tones*; and the intervals, e-f and b-c, are called—but somewhat inappropriately—*major semitones*. Keeping in mind that an interval in music is not a *difference*,² but the ratio of the number of vibrations producing the higher note to the number producing the lower, the major tone is expressed by the ratio 9:8; the minor tone by 10:9; and the major semitone by 16:15. As the octave, which is now universally adopted as the unit, is made up of three major tones, two minor tones, and two major semitones, it is easily found, by combining these

² It is only when the vibration rates of two given notes are replaced by their logarithms that the interval between the notes can be expressed as a *difference*.

numbers, to be the simple ratio 2 : 1. Owing to the order in which the tones and semitones succeed each other, an inequality arises in some of the larger intervals even where they have the same name. The fifth c-g, for instance, is expressed by the ratio 3 : 2; whereas the fifth d-a has the somewhat smaller value 40 : 27. Similarly, the minor thirds, d-f and a-c, are not exactly equal; the latter, as in the case of the fifths, exceeding the former in the ratio 81 : 80.

At first sight it seems strange that a scale apparently so complicated in its structure should have been substituted for the much simpler scale of Pythagoras, in which only two kinds of interval between adjacent notes were employed—a scale, too, which had in its favour a prescription of more than two thousand years, which had supplied music for the odes of Pindar, and had been found equally fitted for the songs of the troubadours as for the sacred chants of St. Ambrose and St. Gregory. And, if the requirements of melody only had to be considered, the Pythagorean scale, no doubt, would still be in general use. But for the purposes of harmony it was altogether unsuitable. And although the introduction of the Natural Scale is commonly ascribed to Zarlino, who wrote towards the end of the sixteenth century, there is abundant evidence to show that practical musicians had been using it for many years before.¹

In his experiments with the monochord, of which he is also reputed the inventor, Pythagoras had discovered very simple relations between the lengths of a string which produce a note, and its octave, its fifth, and its fourth. But the earliest authentic record we have of the subdivisions of these intervals is a description by Philolaos of the tuning of the seven-stringed lyre.

The primitive lyre of the Greeks, as is known, had only four strings. To these Terpander subsequently added three more—so tuned that the middle string formed with them a tetrachord, differing from that of the four original strings

¹ The Natural Scale was first proposed, along with two others, by Ptolemy, in the second century of our era; but it remained neglected by writers on musical theory till revived in his *Institutioni Harmonice* by Zarlino.

only in being a fourth higher. The interval of an octave, in those early days, formed no part of the Greek musical system. It was first introduced into Greece by Pythagoras, who had learned its use during a residence of many years in Egypt. And it is to the seven-stringed lyre, having the first and last strings tuned an octave apart, that the following description of Philolaos refers :—

“The extent of the octave system is a fourth and a fifth; but the fifth is greater than the fourth by a tone in the ratio of 9 : 8; for from the lowest string to the middle string is a fourth, but from the middle string to the upper string is a fifth. . . . The fourth is in the ratio 4 : 3; the fifth in the ratio 3 : 2; and the octave of 2 : 1. Thus the octave system contains five tones and two diecis; the fifth three tones and a diecis; the fourth, two tones and a diecis.”

The ratios here referred to are those which had been discovered by Pythagoras two hundred years before. That they represent, when inverted, the relative vibration rates of the strings, remained unknown for many centuries after.

Although, in the minds of most Pythagoreans, the mystic number of its strings was sufficient reason for retaining the seven-stringed lyre much longer than its real merits would warrant, the imperfection of its scale, allowing as it did a skip of a third from the fifth to the sixth string, gradually led to the employment of an additional string; and, later on, the number was still further increased to fifteen, so as to form two complete octaves. In the diatonic method of tuning, as ordinarily used, the notes of either octave may be expressed in our notation by

a-b-c-d-e-f-g-a ;

with this difference, however, that all the tones were major tones, or had the ratio 9 : 8: and the two diecis or semitones, e-f and b-c, were expressed by the ratio 256 : 243, instead of 16 : 15, as in the Natural Scale. This diatonic scale of the Greeks was adopted by the Romans and early Christians. The position of the semitone in reference to

¹ See original text in Chappell's *History of Music*.

the final or keynote was varied to produce difference of *mode*; but the same graduated *succession* of tones and semitones, in which the essence of a *scale* consists, was preserved unchanged.¹

Such a scale was altogether unsuited to the requirements of harmony; for although the fourth and fifth, reckoned from *c*, were the same as in the Natural Scale, the third and sixth were dissonant. The interval *c-e*, for instance, could be expressed in whole numbers only by the ratio 81 : 64, which is obviously a dissonance; for it is an axiom as old as the time of Pythagoras, and one admitting of experimental proof, that “a consonance requires a simple ratio.” Neither major nor minor triads, therefore, could be employed as consonances, and without such essential chords, harmony—at least as now understood—would be impossible. It was to remedy these defects that the Natural Scale was adopted.

The consonant interval 5 : 4 is nearly equal to the dissonant major third 81 : 64 of the Pythagorean scale, differing from it only in the ratio 80 : 81; and the interval 5 : 3 is less than the dissonant sixth, 27 : 16, in the same ratio. Taking then *c* as the starting-point, if these two consonant intervals be substituted for the third and sixth of the Pythagorean scale, the semitones are reduced from 256 : 243 to the simpler ratio 16 : 15, and the resulting sequence of notes become the Natural Diatonic Scale. Its suitability for harmony is easily seen. The major triad, *c-e-g*, is consonant, being expressed by the ratios 4 : 5 : 6; and, for the same reason, *g-b-d*, and *f-a-c*, constructed on the fifth and fourth respectively, are consonant also. From these and the consonant minor triads, *a-c-e* and *e-g-b*, nearly all the consonant combinations employed in harmony may be derived.

The claim of this scale to be called *natural* is founded on the close relationship existing between each of its notes and the fundamental note or tonic. We have seen that when a

¹ In the *Micrologus de disciplina artis musicae*, of Guido d'Arezzo, in the eleventh century, minute instructions are given for the graduation of the monochord, which show that the Pythagorean scale was then in use.

sound is produced, it is accompanied by one or more partial tones, the number and relative intensities of which determine the quality of the sound. Calling, then, the fundamental note c , its first partial is c_1 , and its second is g_1 . The latter when lowered an octave becomes the fifth of the scale, or *dominant*, a name given to it owing to the governing influence it derives from its close connection with the tonic. The fourth partial of c is e_2 , which, when lowered two octaves, becomes the third of the scale. Hence both g and e are naturally suggested by the compound sound of the tonic. In a similar way d and b are lower octaves of partials of g , and are thus connected through it with c . The latter is itself the second partial of F_1 , which when raised two octaves, becomes the fourth of the scale, or *subdominant*; and the note a which completes the scale is the second lower octave of its fourth partial. Thus it is seen that all the notes of the scale are naturally connected, directly or indirectly, with the fundamental note on which the scale is constructed.

If the requirements of vocal music only had to be considered, or if all orchestral instruments admitted, as the violin does, of having their pitch raised or lowered at pleasure, the Natural Scale might suffice, in the diatonic style of composition, for most ordinary purposes. But when the same theme has to be produced on keyed instruments at a great variety of pitch, such a scale becomes impracticable. To be able to commence on each degree of the scale, and at the same time preserve all the intervals perfect in even such a simple melody as "The Harp that once through Tara's Hall," about thirty keys would be required in each octave; and were it necessary to perform the melody at still smaller differences of pitch, a proportionately larger number would be necessary. Instruments have, indeed, been constructed with as many as fifty-three different keys to the octave; and even with only twice the number ordinarily employed, tolerably pure intervals may be obtained. But although instrument-makers have been working in this direction at the problem of just intonation from the time of Zarlino to the present, many difficulties both of mechanism and manipulation have still to be overcome before such instruments

can be employed for other than experimental purposes. With few exceptions, practical musicians nowadays are agreed that in the piano, organ, and harmonium, not more than twelve notes can be admitted within the compass of an octave, or thirteen, counting the octave note; and the modification of the Natural Scale which will allow each of these being taken as the tonic or key-note of any given melody, is what is here meant by *temperament*.

The different systems of temperament known up to the present may be classed under two general heads—*equal* and *unequal*. In the latter, of which there were several varieties, a preference was given to some keys at the expense of others, by adjusting their intervals much nearer to those of the Natural Scale. The imperfect keys were sometimes called “wolf” keys, from a fancied resemblance, especially in the organ, between some of their dissonant chords and the howling of that animal. In these countries the form of temperament in use up to the middle of the present century was known as *mean-tone* temperament, from the circumstance that the tone, or interval of a second, was a mean between the major and minor tones of the Natural Scale. In it, as in all forms of unequal temperament, modulation was necessarily restricted to certain keys, usually those having not more than three sharps or three flats at the signature; and when, as sometimes happened, the limits of modulation were extended, it was effected by the old expedient of adding one or more notes to the octave.

At present, in the pianoforte, organ, and harmonium, *equal temperament* is almost universally adopted. This consists in dividing the octave into twelve equal intervals or semitones. And as the vibration rate of a note is one half that of its first higher octave, hence the construction of the equal-tempered chromatic scale resolves itself into the simple algebraical problem of inserting eleven geometric means between one and two.

The intervals in the equal-tempered scale, with the exception of the octaves, are all more or less imperfect. Even the fifths and major thirds, the two most important intervals after the octave, are not strictly in tune—the fifths,

except d-a, being slightly flat, the major thirds much too sharp. The beats which arise from the imperfect fifths are too slow to be appreciable, except in long-sustained chords; but roughness having its origin in the sharp thirds is sensibly felt in the organ and harmonium. Even in the piano, an ear accustomed to just intonation easily perceives that there is a defect somewhere. Anyone who has heard a familiar melody, like "The last Rose of Summer," played by a good artist on the violin, is at once struck by the contrast when he hears it afterwards played on the piano. Most of the charm is gone. It is not merely the quality of the sound, in passing from the bowed to the percussion instrument, that is changed: it is the absence of perfect intonation—the first condition of beauty—that makes the difference.

It is in harmony, however, that the full effect of temperament is felt. Contrast is one of the artifices which the musical composer, like the painter, employs to impart vividness and reality to his conceptions. Harsh discords are skilfully interwoven with pleasing concords, and the ear's enjoyment is intensified by the comparison. But the effect is impaired if the smoothness of the concords be in the least degree roughened by any element of dissonance. We have seen that in the major triad c-e-g, when the intervals are perfect, the resultant tones, and principal partial tones, belong to the chord. With tempered intervals, however, the case is different. If, for instance, $c = 264$, then in the equal-tempered scale, $e = 332.5$, $g = 395.5$, nearly. The resultant of c and e has a vibration rate 68.5; that of e and g has a vibration rate 63. Neither of these notes belongs to the chord; and their combination produces five and a half beats in a second. An octave higher, the frequency of the beats is double that number.

In the pianoforte, owing to the rapidity of the movement, and the short duration of its sound, these resultant tones and beats cause little inconvenience; but the roughness arising from them is considerable in the organ and harmonium. And although in certain keys the wolf does not howl so loud as he was wont to do when his territory was more confined, it does not require an over-sensitive ear to discover

that he is still at large. We are told by the apologists of equal temperament that in its intervals and chords the ear "hears what nature would produce rather than what is positively sounded."¹ We regret that in our own case this wonderful power of adaptation is wanting. We never hear equal tempered chords as anything else than imperfect; and we are somewhat sceptical that anyone else does.

But who will apply a remedy? An army of organists will rise in revolt if anyone dares to meddle with their keyboard; and accustomed, as most of them are, to unrestricted freedom of modulation on the pianoforte, they insist on the same privilege for the two other instruments. They must be told, however, that the ears of the audience are also an important factor to be considered; and that both the organ and harmonium would be much more popular instruments than they are if a better system of temperament were applied to them. Although the battle of temperaments has been going on for fully three centuries, it is less than forty years since equal temperament was first used in the organ in these countries; and during that time many protests have been raised against its continuance. Its injurious influence on vocal music is one of its most objectionable features; and the vast superiority, in purity of intonation, of the "tonic sol-fa" societies, who sing without accompaniment, over ordinary choirs, is once more awakening public attention to the necessity of a change.

F. LENNON.

¹ *Lectures on Harmony*, by G. A. Macfarren.

THE CATHOLIC TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT: THE SUREST WAY TO ITS SUCCESS.

(Concluded.)

RESUMING our remarks upon this question, we find the next inquiry to be: What is the surest means to reform those popular ideas and usages, which, "in spite of the rare natural and supernatural qualities of our people," lead many of them to become the slaves and victims of intemperance? If this evil may be likened to a baneful tree, its chief roots consist of these prevalent notions and customs. Yet public opinion is not set against them. It is in part deluded, and in part fettered. People imagine, and do believe, that intoxicating drink is good for everything. They use these drinks eagerly, procure them lavishly, and proffer them pressingly. They multiply occasions for drinking, like votaries of Bacchus; and, with too many, surfeiting is a glory. In such circumstances intemperance is inevitable, and its suppression impossible. These customs, then, must be uprooted by a thoroughly radical reform. We require so to change present notions and habits that the undue esteem of drink will be discredited, and its abuse discountenanced by public opinion itself.

THE MEANS OF REFORMING PUBLIC OPINION.

How may this be done? Human means alone are insufficient. Science is generally unheeded; legislation is all but hopeless; interest, passion, and pleasure favour and develop the consumption of strong drink, and they are almighty in this world. Not even the immense waste and loss of money, time, position, health, and life itself, seems to weigh, either with individuals or society, against the habits or customs of intemperance. No, nor is the knowledge and consciousness of sin effectual in deterring our drunkards from their "darksome and slippery way," or in stirring up the public conscience against occasions so scandalous, so fatal, and yet so general. Withal we say: "*Nil desperandum!*" Cannot Catholic Ireland, by her faith which "overcometh

the world," overcome *one vice*, and that a vice *from which even the Turk is free*? If our readers will kindly refer to what has been written already on this subject¹ our limited space may be reserved for other important matter. "It would surely seem almost to indicate a lack of confidence in the protecting power of the hand of God, if we were to falter for a moment in our hopefulness of success."² But apathy and dissension have to be discarded, and replaced by energetic co-operation. In present circumstances we venture to distinguish between those who, by the means which to themselves seem best, work earnestly for the suppression of intemperance, and others who, on various pleas, do nothing; and, in some cases, discourage or thwart the efforts of honest workers. To the former we would apply the principle: "He that is not against you, is for you" (Mark ix. 39); to the latter, we fear, must be addressed the counter principle: "He that is not with Me, is against Me" (Matt. xii. 30). We cannot deny the continued existence or prevalence of indifference and disagreement regarding the evils of intemperance, its sources, and its remedies. What is the result? Very much of the present state of appalling ruin. We reap the things that were sown. There is no doubt about this. Abundant confirmation is supplied by experience, and many can adduce instances of unaccountable opposition outside; of strange mismanagement, and of even palpable neglect within. To cite such instances should be unpleasant and imprudent on our part; but we may avail ourselves of what the prelates of Leinster, in the *Pastoral* already referred to, have declared upon this point (page 9):—

"It is needless, as it would be unprofitable, here to enumerate in detail the various causes that combined to render a work, apparently so full of promise, an easy prey to the assaults of the enemies, visible and invisible, by which it was beset. One element of decay, however, was apparent on the surface. The work . . . lacked one essential element of lasting success—unity of purpose and of effort. The steps taken in one or another diocese or district by earnest advocates of temperance were not unfrequently made little of, and sometimes even openly derided, elsewhere, by

¹ I. E. RECORD, third series, vol. x., page 1105.

² *Pastoral* of Leinster prelates, Passion Sunday, 1890, page 12.

others no less earnest. The house was divided against itself. It could not long withstand the efforts of its many and powerful assailants combined for its overthrow."

Again, at page 17 :—

"There was a time when total abstinence—adopted even as a means of securing the observance of the virtue of temperance—was objected to and opposed by many. Their opposition to it, more or less openly avowed, placed a serious obstacle in the way of temperance reform."

UNITY OF PURPOSE AND EFFORT.

Supposing a co-operation duly general and energetic, we, as Christians, may expect a corresponding measure of success. But in what are we to co-operate? In those particular means of reform which are admittedly efficacious and suitable. And what are these? (a) *Assiduous preaching and instruction*; (b) *persistent prayers*; (c) *the practice of abstinence*; (d) *with the frequentation of the sacraments, and* (e) *religious organization*. Of these means, not one can suffice by itself. Of all we have treated before:¹ and none but the second last, and perhaps the last itself, requires our present attention. These comprehend all the really *optional* means of success in our work, and within their compass we have to pursue our inquiry as to the surest way to reform the present intemperate usages of society.

ORGANIZATION.

There can scarcely exist a doubt concerning the utility, and even the necessity of organization. Our question is not one of individual interest only; it is also a great social problem, and society is moved most potently by organization. Even if we had not the teaching that "a brother helped by his brother is like a strong city" (Prov. xix. 19); that "Where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20), we might remember the accepted saying, *Fas est ab hoste doceri*. Here society, being a moral personality, has to "cut off," to "pluck out," and to cast away the scandalizing customs and ideas concerning strong drink. For this cause

¹ I. E. RECORD, third series, vol. x., page 1104.

“all who have at heart the glory of God and the salvation of souls” should be “filled with holy zeal.” And every available means must be utilized to impart unity, intensity and continuity to the efforts evoked, so as to render them duly efficacious. This cannot be without organization. For want of organization Father Mathew became the martyr of his cause, whilst we have forfeited almost all the fruits of his apostolate. In fact, what more have we held, so far as society is concerned, than faith in his principles, with grateful admiration for his life and labours?

Of course the cost of this undertaking must be counted; difficulties must be considered. If at all practical, as priests, we may well indeed aspire, in our measure, to the apostolate of temperance, but not to its martyrdom. Yet we submit “where there is a will there is a way;” “in necessity all things are common.” At all events, as St. Augustine says: *potius potiora diligamus*. For information upon the plans of organization which might be adopted, we should refer to the paper in the I. E. RECORD cited above; or, better still, to the *Pastoral*² of the Leinster prelates also quoted, in which are outlined by authority plans of organization suited to all our actual circumstances.

THE SUREST BASIS OF ORGANIZATION.

But the urgency of our task, and past discomfiture, must impress all serious minds with the necessity of putting forth our best efforts. We may liken this duty to that of saving a large district of country from the encroachment of the winter sea, or of a swollen and sweeping river. These are irresistible, save by the solid rock, or by some structure equally firm and strong. If the rock-bound coast is wanting, the breakwater or river bank must be based upon the most fixed foundation; faced, at least, with the most durable material; shaped and compacted with the best of skill; and covering the whole line of danger. Nor is all this enough. After construction, and as long as the waters threaten, the perfect work must be carefully watched and incessantly repaired.

From this we may learn that the organization which

² See *Pastoral* of Passion Sunday, 1890, pages 20-35.

has to be relied on for the reform of the prevailing intemperate ideas and usages which is to discredit the former and discountenance the latter—may not be got up by haphazard, and then left to itself. If prudent we must search out the surest foundation, build with the best material, and afterwards look with solicitude to whatever would imperil our work. We inquire, then, What is the surest basis to build upon? The question resolves itself into two points—who are to be the chief members of our organization? and what is to be its bond? We say “chief members,” because no Catholic is to be excluded from his or her share of the work and fruits of our temperance movement.

THE CHIEF MEMBERS.

Well, the chief members cannot be the intemperate—even supposing them reformed. Such an association would be discredited before public opinion, and its pledges, even of total abstinence, should be regarded as a stigma. This has really happened, as all know, and as is testified even in the Episcopal pronouncement referred to so often.¹ Consequently any person, on being asked to drink upon any or all of the multiplied and ever-recurring occasions which are stated by public sanction, although preferring not to drink, would yet shrink from refusing lest the suspicion of previous intemperance might attach. Therefore, the too frequent occasions of intemperance can never be effectually discountenanced till they are opposed by persons, and, as far as possible, by *all* persons, who are “above suspicion.” This principle of enlisting the co-operation of the good to the greatest possible extent, is of vital moment to our success. It may then be well to establish it more and more by adducing the declarations and the practice of those whose authority has greatest weight.

St. Augustine in a letter addressed to Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, on the suppression of certain intemperate abuses, wrote :—

“Your letter, so full of charity, gives me boldness to discuss this matter with you as if I were talking with myself. I think,

¹ See pages 24, 25.

² See *Discipline of Drink*, page 28.

then, that these abuses must be removed, not imperiously, nor harshly; by instruction rather than by precept; by permission rather than by threats. It is thus one must act in a multitude; we may be severe towards the sins of a few. If we use any threats, let it be done with sorrow, alleging future penalties from Holy Scripture, that God may be rather feared in our words than we ourselves in our authority. Thus, first the spiritual will be moved, or those who are nearly spiritual; and afterwards by their authority and gentle yet urgent admonitions, the multitude will be induced to give way."

The prelates of Leinster, in the late joint *Pastoral*, write :—

"It would be a fatal mistake if the total abstinence pledge were to be regarded only in its application to cases of intemperance . . . There is reason, indeed, to fear that . . . many who otherwise would gladly undertake the observance of the virtue of temperance in this most excellent form, are foolishly deterred from doing so, lest by taking the total abstinence pledge they should in some way expose themselves to discredit." ¹

Cardinal Manning addressing the "Guards" of the League of the Cross, on New Year's Day, 1882, said :—

"He would say at once, that he was confident that the growth of the League of the Cross was, under God, in chief owing to them. If they had not been steadfast; if they had broken their pledge; if their conduct had not been so exemplary as to win from the public judgment, the public opinion, and he would say the public opposition of this country, an acknowledgment that the League of the Cross was a solid and steadfast association of total abstinence against which no reproach could be cast; and if they had not this moral force, this moral power, this moral dignity, he might say the League of the Cross would not spread as it had."

Speaking at Somerstown, in September, 1885, his Eminence, speaking to this same point, said :—

"The League of the Cross is, first of all, intended to save souls that are perishing. But do not let anyone believe that the League of the Cross is a confraternity of reclaimed drunkards. I am the President of the League of the Cross, and I am not a reclaimed drunkard. . . . We have thousands of little innocent children, who are growing up from their infancy without the knowledge or the taste of intoxicating drink. I do hope and

¹ See *Pastoral* for Passion Sunday, 1890, pages 24, 25.

believe that there are a large number in the League who have been reclaimed from the horrible bondage of drink, and they are the friends of God. There are also in the League those who were not under the power of drink, and who took the pledge not so much for themselves, as to give an example to others.

"We read in the Gospel that the kingdom of heaven is like a great net let down into the sea, and that it takes up all kinds of fish, good and bad; and when the net is drawn up to the shore, the bad are thrown away. Well, I always say, that the League of the Cross is like that great net. . . Now, we know this—that there have been thousands and tens of thousands of men and women so drowned in drink, so drowned in the mud and mire of evils that follow from drink, that unless there was a great net to draw them out of this depth of misery, tens of thousands would have been lost. . . But the League of the Cross is something more than a great net; it is a confraternity of the most sober people; it is also a brotherhood of the friends of God."

The Rev. Thomas Conaty, D.D., Worcester, Mass., U.S.A., President of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, America, addressing the members of the Father Mathew Temperance League, Dublin, in July, 1889, said :—

"I take it that here, as in America, there are false impressions prevalent in regard to the aims and objects of the total abstinence movement. Some appear to think it has been established primarily, if not solely, for the reformation of drunkards. Nothing could be more erroneous. I say it is for no such thing. That is the smallest, and probably the least important, part of the total abstinence work. . . I say if you would do the work efficiently and thoroughly, in the name of God, save the youth; preserve them in total abstinence, and you will not have so many drunkards seeking reformation. Let men become total abstainers, so as to save themselves from the dangers that lead up to drunkenness. Give us sober mothers, who teach by word and example the sacred virtue of temperance, and the chances are good that we shall have sober children, easily trained to habits of total abstinence; we shall have drink driven from the home, and religion and peace and comfort its inmates. I am president of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, which is sixty thousand strong. We have organizations throughout every State and territory of the Union, and I affirm, that in that body of sixty thousand total abstainers, there are at least seventy per cent. who have never tasted liquor."

Other authorities are at hand, but need not be cited. We cannot, however, miss this further opportunity of confirming

our proposition by the affirmation of the Chair of Peter. It was the association presided over by Dr. Conaty, in 1889, that merited the praise and commendation of Leo XIII., and the point most emphasized and extolled by his Holiness is the principle of taking the total abstinence pledge for the sake of good example. The words are :—

“Hence we esteem worthy of all commendation the noble resolve of your pious associations by which they pledge themselves to abstain totally from every kind of intoxicating drink. Nor can it at all be doubted that this determination is a proper and a truly efficacious remedy for this very great evil; and that so much the more strongly will *all* be induced to put this bridle upon appetite, by how much the greater are the dignity and influence of those who give the example.”

The readers will see that we have emphasized one word, and will not unkindly question our claim to do so. Our cause well deserves, as it indeed requires, the advantage of every legitimate enforcement.

THE SUREST BOND OR PLEDGE.

The surest members having been determined, with this understanding, that no one, unless proved unworthy, is to be excluded, next comes the question: What form or practice of abstinence is surest and best to be proposed for common observance? Well, we have first to recall these practices, or pledges or resolutions, as they may be named. The pledges limiting indulgence to *one* drink or *two* each day are familiar. The pledges “against drinking in public-houses,” and “against drinking spirits, brandy, gin, or rum,” are also well-known. Then, recently, our Irish prelates have recommended “a pledge never to give or take a treat,” “a pledge against ‘wetting the bargain’ at fairs and markets,” and a pledge against “pressing drink” on friends. One eminent and well-beloved archbishop, when communicating to a press agent his predilection for such pledges, said :—“If we could get rid of these customs and notions, the back-bone of drunkenness in this country would be broken.” The latest, and, we think, practically the best, list of Catholic pledges

may be found in the *Pastoral* of the Right Rev. Bishop of Nottingham, issued last Advent :—

“ 1. To abstain entirely from the use of intoxicants out of meals.

“ 2. To abstain from taking intoxicating drink in a public-house.

“ 3. To abstain from treating, or being treated, in a public-house.

“ 4. To abstain from all intoxicating liquors from after the mid-day meal on Saturdays till the commencement of the mid-day meal on Sundays, in honour of our Blessed Lady.

“ 5. To observe total abstinence from all distilled spirits.

“ 6. To observe total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors.”

Now, in selecting any of these practices of abstinence for general—not individual—recommendation, as the surest and best practical bond for the necessary, or at least, all but necessary organization, the readers of the I. E. RECORD will recognise a work of the greatest responsibility. The responsibility is, of course, their own; we merely offer suggestions, and show reason for our opinions. The end of the movement must be considered throughout. It is to promote the glory of God and the welfare of our people, by stemming and abating the torrent of intemperance which has too long devastated our land, and which becomes but more threatening to all our interests here and hereafter.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

What pledge will enable a considerable and sufficient body of our population to stand as an immovable breakwater against this sweeping torrent? What pledges will save weaker brethren, behind the protecting barrier of the stronger? What pledge will lead an adequate number to reach the sources of danger, and correct the evil in its first developments? Are not these points the essential ones? Well, no pledge will withstand the brunt of the onset of our actual customs regarding intoxicating drinks save the pledge of total abstinence. Any other pledge will speedily be overturned by the action of these customs. So it has been, and so it is. The pledges of limited abstinence will support that of total abstinence, and will, in turn, be protected by it, just as the looser and softer filling of the breakwater supports the

resisting power of the impenetrable front which saves it. Yes, and the sources of our intemperance—the fountain springs of our intemperate customs—shall be dried up whenever, and only whenever, an imposing and influential number of representative persons set themselves by word and example to discredit the unfortunate and baneful esteem of stimulants, and to discountenance their abuse. For, total abstinence, as a living reality, is required, and nothing less is sufficient, to make our people see that strong drink is not the best thing for health, for strength, for happiness, for medicine, &c. And the association of hospitality, friendship, &c., with drinking and surfeiting shall never be sundered among us till many are everywhere found who, while fulfilling “all justice” as neighbours and friends, steadfastly refuse “to drink.”

This reasoning is not simulated, but strictly correct, and fully confirmed both negatively and positively, by experience. The rule of *minimi medii* is indeed dictated by all wisdom; but practical wisdom must proportion the means to the end, and observe past results.

Abstinence, whether total or partial, temporary or for life, is no new thing. It is one of reason’s very early lessons; while religion but enforces its claims, helps in its endurance, and rewards its fortitude. This abstinence, as applied to intoxicating drink, is often noticed in sacred history; and, coming to our immediate purpose, we all know that the ecclesiastical annals and traditions of a nation bear testimony to its employment as an antidote for intemperance. We, of the present day, are indebted to many who have preceded us for the fruits of their efforts in the cause of temperance and for our advantage of greater experience. Some of them, happily, still live and work in the good cause; and if any failed to accomplish their full purpose, or to make their work abiding, others had a greater measure of success. To deal critically with such efforts, to set them up as rival and opposing systems, should be unchristian and insane. All their plans were but means to the same end, and as means to that end all must be judged. The end to be attained is the one rule of selection, and according to their utility they may be preferred, altered, combined, &c.

CARDINAL MANNING.

Not fault-finding, therefore, but earnestly seeking the surest means, we submit that the proposition stated a little above is confirmed by experience. To show this we might refer to the sketch of the various efforts made by Oliver Plunket, Father Mathew, by Drs. Furlong and Leahy, by Dr. Warren, and Cardinals Moran and M'Cabe, and by others less noticeable, though not less devoted. It is to be found in the I. E. RECORD for July, 1889. But we shall venture upon new ground, and go into the exact particulars of the efforts of one whose name, of itself, gives prestige and assurance to every cause with which it is associated. This name is that of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. In his Eminence, we may be permitted to say, all recognise great perfection of talent and culture, practical wisdom, popular sympathy, and truly pastoral zeal. His great work—the Westminster Diocesan School System—his leading part in all the great social questions of the great metropolis of the world, &c., evince his powers ; and besides, we Irish love him for his love of Ireland—*diligit enim gentem nostram*. Now for particular facts to show that experience lead Cardinal Manning to regard the combination of total abstinence and the practice of religious duties as the surest—nay, *the only* sure—means of founding and maintaining a really efficient association for the suppression of intemperance. We shall number our paragraphs hereon for clearness' sake.

1. In 1857 Father Richardson founded the "Catholic Association for the Suppression of Drunkenness." His motto was: *Our enemy is not drink, but drunkenness*. He gave pledges, varying with persons, habits and occasions, but not a pledge of total abstinence ; and he organized his associates for united prayer, good example, and devotion to Mary Immaculate, To him the cardinal—then archbishop—having been consecrated in June, 1865, wrote on 3rd February, 1866:—

"MY DEAR FATHER RICHARDSON,—I most heartily approve of the Catholic Association for the Suppression of Drunkenness, and desire to see it extended to every Mission in the Diocese of Westminster ; and I pray with all my heart, that the great evil

which ruins homes and souls, may be effectually checked by your earnest labour. Wishing you every blessing,

“ I remain, your affectionate servant in Christ,

“ ✠ HENRY EDWARD,

“ *Archbishop of Westminster.*

“ YORK-PLACE, 3rd Feb., 1866.”

2. Coming to 1872 we find drunkenness unsuppressed, and a simple Irish workman—the mouthpiece of Providence—imploping the Archbishop “to get some priest to give Father Mathew’s pledge.” His Grace volunteered to be the priest, resolving to himself: “I shall never ask any priest to do what I may do myself,” and (if we may add) with better effect. The League of the Cross had been initiated in Liverpool, by Father Nugent; the Archbishop would have it in London, and for a more hopeful beginning, Rome was asked for its blessing and for indulgences. The reply was: “Send fuller information upon the state of things which require and justify such an extreme measure.” In procuring this information the Archbishop was lead to realize that his previous ideas of the evils entailed by intemperance had been utterly inadequate; he felt as one for the first time “in a chamber of horrors,” and sitting down, he wrote a relation to the Propaganda, extending over numerous pages of foolscap. The reply now was: “If these things be true, go on, in God’s name, and ask any favour in our gift.” Then, in 1873, the League of the Cross was founded in the Diocese of Westminster, having the Archbishop as President, and being grafted by his hand upon the living root of Father Mathew’s work. Its obligations were two. The first to live as good practical Catholics. The second, to take the pledge of total abstinence. So Archbishop Manning, having had over six years’ experience of the best efforts, short of total abstinence, to suppress drunkenness, found that total abstinence was a necessity.

3. Having established the League of the Cross, the Archbishop did not at first intend to withdraw his patronage from the associations based upon the pledges of moderate abstinence. He declared:—“I would have two kinds of pledge—one for the mortified, who never taste drink; and the other for the temperate, who never abuse it. If I can make

these two classes work together, I will work in the midst of them. If I cannot get them to work together, I will work with both of them separately." But experience soon convinced him that this dualism or latitudinarianism, however plausible, should result in frustrating his efforts and disappointing his hopes. Moderation in theory was but a relative term, and failed to bar actual excess. The largest allowance became the general standard, and the supposed path of safe sobriety led many to drunkenness who previously had been secure.

4. The Archbishop consequently became inflexibly devoted to total abstinence as the only principle upon which he could maintain a solid and steadfast association of sober men; as the only safe rule of temperance for children and many others; and as the only hopeful means of reforming public opinion regarding drunkenness and all that leads to drunkenness. This he declared at the First Convention of the League of the Cross, held in the Crystal Palace in July, 1875, just four months after he was created cardinal. He was chairman, and spoke as deciding the future principle of the league. Here are the very words :—

"First of all, I may announce to you that the experience of all who have had the guidance of this movement—and I may say that the profound and mature conviction of us all—is, that it is impossible to unite together those who abstain altogether and those who do not. I do not mean that we are not in brotherly unity with them all. We embrace every sober man as a fellow-worker in the same field, whether he be pledged or whether he be not pledged. If he be a sober man he is with us; 'He that is not against us in this is with us;' but we find it impossible to give any pledge, or to take any pledge from anyone who will not take the pledge altogether; being convinced that unless we stand shoulder to shoulder in the firm resolution of entirely renouncing all intoxicating drink, and all places wherein intoxicating drink is sold, we never shall maintain the firm, solid, compact formation which is absolutely necessary for the existence of the league."

5. Since 1875 fifteen years have seen Cardinal Manning increase continuously in zeal for total abstinence. For its actual fruits he is full of gratitude, and regarding its possible results he has unshaken confidence that in it above all forms of temperance lies the remedy for our present evil.

He has obtained for it the blessing of two Popes—the last blessing of Pius IX., and the first of Leo. XIII.—with great spiritual favours. His voice has been heard over England, and his words read over the world, preaching the League of the Cross, and communicating the grace of manifold salvation to tens of thousands by means of the total abstinence pledge. Of this salvation his Eminence gives personal testimony well deserving of repetition and particular attention. He says:—*“If we had begun the League of the Cross twenty-five years ago, we should have a hundred thousand more Catholics in London.”* Pages might be filled with similar extracts; but, in order to close this confirmation of our view without further delay, we take a passage from the letter of his Eminence to the Bishop of Cork in October last, on the centenary celebration of Father Mathew’s birthday. He wrote:—

“MY LORD,—Let me congratulate you on the great and joyful solemnities of Father Mathew’s centenary in his own city and home. They will begin with the blessing of God, and be carried out in faith and charity to all men.

“Every man and every association working to keep our people from the plague of intemperance has the sympathy and goodwill of the League of the Cross. It bids them all God-speed, but it inflexibly maintains its own inviolate rule of total abstinence from all intoxicating drink. This was Father Mathew’s pledge, and from this the League of the Cross will never depart. This, too, was the inheritance bequeathed to us, and we will gather into it not only the fallen, that they may rise again, but the innocent, that they may never fall. Father Mathew on his death-bed rejoiced to hear of the United Kingdom Alliance to obtain from the Legislature the powers to check and control the drink trade. He saw that the work of one man may die with him, and that nothing but a firm organization of men could keep alive and perpetuate such a work as he had wrought. The League of the Cross was that organization. . . . His prayers were offered for you. His work has sprung up anew. . . . Go on then with a manly courage, for a good cause may be hindered, but it cannot fail. God is with those that serve Him, and if He be with us, who can be against us? Total abstinence is a counsel of a higher life, against which the world has no power, if only we are faithful to ourselves . . .

“My Lord, believe me to be,

“Your affectionate Servant and Brother,

✠ HENRY EDWARD,

“Card. Archbishop of Westminster.

“President of the League of the Cross in England.”

OUR ARGUMENT.

No confirmation of our opinion could be more desirable, and nothing more, we think, is to be desired. We then find total abstinence commended as the surest means for carrying to success the third and only remaining essential issue of the Catholic temperance movement; we find that total abstinence practised by an organized association, comprising especially the good and perfect members of society, and established upon a basis widespread as may be, is the surest, if not the only sure, means of procuring the necessary reformation of the popular notions and usages which lead to and perpetuate intemperance, despite all opposition, social and religious. Well, putting this and our two former conclusions together; taking it for granted that the success of this movement implies success in reclaiming the intemperate, preserving the temperate, and reforming intemperate customs; and taking it as proven that a widespread and durable association of genuine total abstinence is the surest, or perhaps the only sure, means of accomplishing each of these works, we must accept the conclusion that the surest way to the success of the Catholic temperance movement is the formation of such an association in every parish in the land.

OBJECTIONS TO TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

We have not to meet the objections raised against that abstinence which runs counter to true virtue, and which has been spoken of as "total abstinence run mad." Our practice and principle is inspired by faith, hope, and charity; hinges upon prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance; is ratified and commended by the head of the Church, and even exemplified by her princes. There have been, however, and probably still exist, opinions contrary to Catholic total abstinence as the surest remedy for our intemperance; and, contention or aggression apart, we would explain our position.

IMPOSSIBILITY.

Is it possible, some ask, to establish and maintain an organized association of total abstainers exclusively, in

every parish throughout Ireland? Is not total abstinence essentially "ascetic"? and how can a good number of the people be expected to undertake and to persevere in its practices? Is not all this utopian, extreme, irrational? Why not adhere to temperate and practicable means? What is best in itself may not be eligible in general; and the ways of Providence are mostly ordinary. There should not be, in all common sense and propriety, such an over-riding of legitimate tastes and social exigencies.

In reply: Catholic total abstainers, beginning with Father Mathew, have been impressed as much as others by the weight of these considerations, and always felt them to preponderate against total abstinence, regarded only as a more perfect form of the virtue of temperance. But taking to heart the evils of intemperance—their woefulness, their prevalence, their hitherto invincible power—and having found all other forms of abstinence ineffectual for the removal and prevention of such evils, they were convinced that the reasons in favour of total abstinence out-weighed decisively those against it. So it has been in all reforms. Extreme evils will not be cured but by extreme remedies. And the amputation of a cherished and most useful member, as a necessary means of saving the life of the rest, is exacted even from the most sensitive by science and religion in their respective domains. Authorities need not be quoted.

As to the unwillingness of the people, it is falsified in theory and in fact. What do we, as a nation, gain by upholding our drink-customs? Poverty, disease, degradation, death, sin, and, for too many individuals, the marks of reprobation. What are the *experienced* fruits of total abstinence? Plentifulness, prosperity, innocence, peace, and sanctification. What is given up in becoming a total abstainer? Generally, nothing more than a momentary gratification, altogether unnecessary, and very often most treacherous. Injustice would be done our people by anyone who could believe them unwilling to purchase such secure deliverance with manifold advantages at a cost so small and so salutary—by a privation despicable to reason at the outset and soon esteemed and cherished. Our people

are not sensual. They are readily drawn to acts of self-denial when noble and Christian motives are proposed for such action. Witness their discipline of fasting in the past, and *a propos* their grateful affection and reverence for the memory of Father Mathew. Let anyone like him, in vocation and in spirit, raise the banner of total abstinence among his people and in his church, call for followers in a religious crusade against intemperance, and he will surely find hundreds, and among them "the flower of his flock," rallying cheerfully around him. In the battle some may fall off. The weakness of enfeebled wills must, apart from any special grace, prove fatal to the resolution of the weaker brethren. The enemies without will not cease in employing all their skill and power against the good work and against its leader. But all through the fight hundreds will be steadfast, and hundreds will be added ; immense and immediate good will be effected ; social reformation will perceptibly advance ; and the total abstinence standard will not be suffered by the Irish people to know even the danger of defeat while they see it wave over the consecrated heads of their prelates, and carried by the consecrated hands of their priests.

INADVISABILITY.

But these things cannot be, according to not a few. The weight of ecclesiastical opinion is not on the side of Father Mathew and his followers, but rather opposed to their plan, as a whole, or at least unable to see its advisability. They apprehend disunion, erroneous judgments of conscience, and reaction. They dislike the implied restriction of individual liberty, and the departure from the established customs of private and social life. They object to the additional labour that should be undertaken by the clergy. They protest against the requisition of lay speakers in temperance meetings. And they can feel justified in condemning everyone who advocates and practises total abstinence.

Now these grounds of objection, and all that would support a similar conclusion, cannot be opposed to a measure of necessity. Besides, it is not an unheard-of

thing that a good cause, "gainsaid everywhere," had to make its way against strong but ill-founded opposition. That it is so in our case, we shall briefly show.

(a) As to ecclesiastical opinion, we can distinguish between theory and practice, between the past and present, and between the general body and any individual member. The theory of total abstinence *was* deemed questionable, but is no longer so. This change is no wonder to those who understand how the Holy Spirit works in the Church, and we need not delay in explanation or in citation of examples. We must remark, however, that the greatness of the grace given to Father Mathew was precisely that of resolving, so long before the general clerical body, upon a cause since commended by the Church as "a noble resolve," and "a truly efficacious remedy" for the great evil of intemperance.¹ Regarding the practice of total abstinence by any particular individual, we must allow no judgment save that of God and conscience. Total abstainers must not judge those who do not totally abstain, and *vice versa*. Rather are we to presume that each one does what is practically the better thing for himself. But if we consider the general body of the clergy, and ask whether it may be expected to furnish the needful aid in this necessary work, the answer must be: yes, and abundantly. Circumstances will hinder individuals, but among the general body numbers will be found able and willing to carry out the heroic resolve for the sake of so many of their perishing people. Our seminaries are preparing hundreds of such priests. Tens and twenties are to be found on the mission in every diocese. Fifties are, as we ourselves have found, ready for "this noble resolve" in particular places—priests of every age, and grade, and dignity—and several of our prelates are veterans in the ranks. Let no one ask: Why then were the Conventions of the League of the Cross at Thurles and Cork such unhappy failures? For, amongst other reasons, their very sense of sincerity, discipline, and prudence hindered many life-long total abstainers from attending these conventions. On this head we owe

¹ See *Biography*, by J. F. Maguire, chaps. vi., vii.

an apology or explanation to the stranger priests who came at such inconvenience to Ireland; but even they will have seen that the abstention has been justified by subsequent events. There must be no false start; moreover, the trumpet must give no uncertain sound, and we must be enlisted and hopefully organized before called to parade. Please God, these things will come.

(b) Discretion and docility to the admonitions of the Holy See will keep us, as far as lies in any human organization, free from the evils and inconveniences of disunion, errors in conscience, of mere excitement and enthusiasm, of intolerance, of singularity, &c. These things, indeed, should not be; but the condemnation of a good and even necessary work, because accidentally connected with such mistaken conduct, is itself condemned by the severe words of Christ in Matt. xxiii. 24: "Blind guides, who strain out a gnat and swallow a camel." Of course, the severity of this sentence hinders its application amongst us, save as a warning. Let us accordingly have total abstinence, but not disunion and the rest.

(c) The additional labour to be undertaken by us in consequence of total abstinence organization will be in no way extraordinary for all country districts. The usual sermons, visitation, stations, and devotions may be utilized with sufficient effect in all country districts. In towns, special weekly or monthly meetings shall be necessary; and there must be no small pains employed in the many duties devolving upon the spiritual director or president of a total abstinence confraternity; withal, this is not a reason against such an association, but an argument rather for its necessity. As for the victims of proselytism, so for those of intemperance, let provision be made. It will repay the provision. For, if we calculate the extent to which our priests' work is hindered, and afterwards neutralized, by intemperance, we should at once see that a successful total abstinence organization in any parish will enable the clergy to prevent evil, and promote every form of good with threefold effect.

(d) Lay speakers deserve an apologist. Let them be confined to subjects of science, and to statements of experi-

ence, and they can do great service under an ecclesiastical president. Laymen have a real apostolate in England and abroad: in the cities of Ireland also they have done good service. In centres of population, Catholic halls and clubs are indispensable. Of these institutes, laymen of talent and character are the very heart and soul. Only give us speakers who will avoid intolerance and vain-glory, and we beg to be allowed to say—*Utinam omnes prophetizent.*

CONCLUSION.

If there be other objections which concern us we do not know them, and those adduced we trust may be reckoned as fairly explained away. It remains then but to submit to the readers of the I. E. RECORD our views on the Catholic temperance movement, and to apologize for our length of treatment. They will have many things to interpret kindly, and perhaps some things to censure; but we trust they will agree with us upon the *true issue* of this movement, upon its *three essential parts*, and upon the *surest way to its success*.

MICHAEL KELLY, M.SS.

THE LIVING ROSARY IN DETAIL.—II.

THE LEGAL MACHINERY.

IT is my purpose to set down in this paper the entire body of authentic legislation which applies at present to the Living Rosary sodality. To this I shall add a complete table of the indulgences granted up to the present date, together with an exact specification of the conditions required for gaining them. These together make up what may be regarded as the machinery of the sodality; machinery which the skilled hand and watchful eye of a zealous Director can alone control and keep in motion. They form the dead letter of the law, which his living voice and

authority must interpret and apply for the benefit of the associates who are his subjects.

“Besides these laws [says the late Dominican General, Father Larroca, in his official letter of 1887], the Directors will be free to make local regulations, according as it shall seem expedient to them before God, each one for the associates entrusted to him; and, indeed, in order that the devotion of the Living Rosary flourish, it is necessary that all the associates abide entirely by their Superiors in all things which are determined for the good government of each association, provided that these do not openly contradict the decrees of the Holy See and of the Supreme Moderators. We wish, however, that in all books, pamphlets, and small works of whatsoever kind, which may be published in future concerning this devotion of the Living Rosary, whether by religious of our Order or by persons who are outside our Order, the decrees of supreme authority which, from their promulgation in this present *brochure*, have now, from this out, a *legislative* force for all associates, should be always clearly distinguished from those regulations which, when enacted by the authority of Directors for particular districts, have only a *directive* force; so that every associate may have certain information with regard to his obligations.”

Here we see a clear and sharp distinction drawn between the dead letter of the law and its living interpretation, between the machinery essential to the working of the sodality and the fittings or supplementary gear that may be added with advantage by the skill of the local craftsman. The former is necessary, the latter not to be neglected. My purpose, as already stated, is to deal with each in a separate article.

The laws of the sodality are twenty in number, and I feel that to transcribe them, as well as the official elenchus of the indulgences, here in the I. E. RECORD, will be to do a service to many priests who may be unsupplied with the official statement in Latin, published and vended at the Generalizia Domenicana, Via San Sebastiano, Roma. I promise to eliminate, or at least carefully to discriminate, all remarks of my own, so that the reader may regard what follows as authentic. This, I think, will be more satisfactory to him than to have to trust to either incomplete or doubtfully accurate accounts from the pens of unofficial writers.

What follows, then, is a literal and ungarbled translation from the only official source :—

THE DECREES OF THE HOLY SEE AND OF THE SUPREME
MODERATORS FOR THE SODALITY OF THE LIVING
ROSARY.

1. Each and every Director of the Living Rosary, even general or diocesan, in existence on the 15th day of November, 1877, is confirmed in his office for life, with the power of choosing new Zelators to be appointed even over new sets of fifteen.

2. In the same way, all Zelators and Zelatrices in existence on the 15th day of November, 1877, are confirmed in their office for life.

3. In fine, all associates received by the aforesaid Zelators up to this time, or who may in future be received by them, are to be considered as legitimately admitted, so that they freely enjoy all the indulgences and privileges conceded, or to be conceded, to the Living Rosary.

4. Directors so confirmed (even diocesan Directors) cannot in future elect, as formerly, new Directors.

5. New Directors can only be appointed by the Very Rev. Master of the Order, or by the Priors Provincial in virtue of his delegation, which has now been entrusted to each one of them in his own province.

6. All Directors of Confraternities of the Most Sacred Rosary which have been canonically erected in the several districts through the Master-General of the Friars Preachers, with the consent of the Ordinary, or which will be erected in future, are to be considered as at the same time *pleno jure* and *ipso facto* the legitimate Directors of the Living Rosary, as is clear from the brief of Pope Pius IX., *Quod jure haereditario*.

7. Since the sodality which has the name of the Living Rosary does not attain to the nature of a confraternity (for it has no *liber matricularis* for enrolling names, nor are the associates bound to any public exercises, but divided into sets of fifteen, drawn by lot every month a mystery to meditate upon each day of the month and a decade to recite), it is by no means to be considered bound by the ordinary laws of confraternities, and consequently a plurality of associations of this sort can lawfully maintain themselves in the same place under different legitimate rulers. On this account, since laws have no retro-active force, Directors in existence before the 15th of November, 1877, and once confirmed for life on their personal title, can exercise their zeal in every place and in the same manner as formerly, even in places where confraternities of the Most Sacred Rosary or convents of the Friars Preachers are established. It is otherwise, however, with those who have received faculties as

Directors or Presidents after the 15th of November, 1877: they are dealt with in the following number.

8. Provincials of the Order of Preachers, each one within the limits of his own province, can appoint *local*, but not *general* Directors, *e. g.*, for the whole of some diocese. If by any chance some other arrangement would seem to be called for, let recourse always be had to the Right Reverend Master of the Order. Whence, as a Director at the present time does not receive faculties except for a certain defined district, if he passes from place to place, as, *e. g.*, a parish priest who is transferred from one parish to another, all faculties granted to him cease *ipso facto*.

9. By special delegation of the Master of the Order, Provincials can appoint Directors in places in which there is no Province of our Order at present; for example, in Switzerland or Algiers.

10. In places where a confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary is to be found, Provincials must not appoint other Directors of the Living Rosary. If at any time, through a special cause, other action should be necessary, let recourse always be had to the Right Rev. Master of the Order.

11. If a confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary be erected in a place where there is some Director or President of the Living Rosary appointed after the 15th November, 1877, then from the very fact of the erection of the confraternity all the faculties granted to the aforesaid Director or President, whether by Master-General of the Order or by Provincials, cease, and the Director of the confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary has *pleno jure* all power over everything pertaining in this place to the Sodality of the Living Rosary.

12. In places where there is no confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary Provincials can appoint *local* Directors either *for life* or *for so many years*, according as it seems expedient to them before God.

13. The following may be used as the form of the diploma which the Provincials will grant:—

[For this see the end of the article in last month's I. E. RECORD on the Living Rosary.]

14. Although local Directors can no longer appoint other Directors, they are quite able to appoint one or more men or women, who, with the name of *President*, or *Zelator President*, or another similar name, under the authority of the Director, and in his district, preside over several Zelators, according as it shall seem expedient before God.

15. And Provincials can do the same in places where there is no confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary, if there can be found no suitable priest able and willing to undertake the position of Director.

16. As a regular practice, every Zelator or Zelatrix is to hold

a meeting each month with his or her associates, in order that the mysteries be distributed to everyone by lot. For the Sovereign Pontiffs have so disposed in their approbations of this sodality. If, however, the aforesaid meeting with the associates cannot take place, then the Zelator or Zelatrix, along with two companions, is to proceed to the drawing of lots for the mysteries, and is to send the mysteries marked out by lot to the absent associates. So the Most Holy Father Pope Gregory XVI. permitted, by authority delegated to the most eminent Cardinal Lambruschini, Protector of the Living Rosary.

17. With regard to the changing of the mysteries of the Living Rosary, besides the *accustomed* methods, by means of lots, which is adopted in the monthly change of the mysteries, power is granted, in order to obtain the Living Rosary indulgences, to admit another method, according to which the mysteries once assigned by lot, are, from that out, changed privately at the beginning of each month by the several Rosarians, according to the natural series of the mysteries. So the Most Holy Father Pope Gregory XVI. declared in *oraculo vivae vocis*, June 7, 1839.

[We must conclude, then, it seems, that the adoption of either one or other of the two methods of distribution above mentioned is a necessary condition for gaining the indulgences attached to the recital of the daily decade. If the mysteries, *e.g.*, were to be distributed according to the fancy of the Zelator or President, the indulgence would not be gained. If two associates, whose fortune in the lottery had failed to please them, were to exchange their mysteries, their indulgences would not be gained. If an associate, through neglect, were to forget his mystery, and then take to saying some other than what had been legitimately assigned him, he, I should say, would not gain his indulgences. Such seem to me the conclusions to be drawn from 17.]

18. In the change of mysteries effected by the usual method of lots, power is granted to postpone such a change until fifteen days after the completion of a month after the last change, on the occurrence of a reasonable cause; for example, some feast day. So our Most Holy Father Pope Gregory XVI. has declared in the aforesaid *vivae vocis oraculum*.

19. From the declaration itself of the Right Rev. Father, Vicar-General of the Order of Preachers, then Supreme Moderator of the Living Rosary, "each and every one of the aforesaid associations must retain the one, identical, genuine name of the Living Rosary, without the addition of any other title; in the method of reciting the accustomed mysteries of the Most Sacred

Rosary, let no novelty be introduced by which *the authentic Rosary dedicated to God and the most Blessed Virgin Mary might be made a thing of the past.*" A matter which was declared anew, and more explicitly still, by the Right Rev. Father, Master-General Joseph Mary Larroca, in the following words:—"We expressly declare that there is but one Living Rosary, altogether entrusted to our Order, which we do not permit to be mixed up with any other sodality of whatsoever name, whether of the Rosary of the Apostleship of Prayer, or of the Rosary of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, or of any other of the same sort, lest the danger of losing the indulgences should become imminent. And that our will in this matter may be quite clear to everyone, we hereby deprive all persons propagating the Living Rosary mixed up in this way with another sodality, of all faculties as Zelator or Zelatrix, Counsellor or "Consiliaria," President, even Director, and declare them deprived of them, and we take from them all power of intruding themselves into the propagation and administration of the Living Rosary.

Members, however, of any association whatsoever, can enter the Living Rosary, and associates of the Living Rosary, likewise, can take part in other associations; but upon this express condition, that they satisfy the obligations of the two associations separately, so that in that way no one may be allowed to confound the sodalities.

20. Since the devotion of the Most Sacred Rosary, such as it was instituted by the most holy Patriarch St. Dominick, tends chiefly to this, that the mind and heart of each one of the faithful be nourished by the *constant* meditation of *all* the mysteries of the life of our Lord Jesus Christ and of His Most Holy Mother, Directors of the Living Rosary, and all in general who co-operate in the propagation of this pious sodality, must vigorously promote this object, which our Father St. Dominick esteemed so highly as a remedy for the evils of his own time, and which is still of such efficacy at the present day for the increase of faith and charity in the souls of the faithful; and in consequence they must ever bear in mind that *this devotion of the Living Rosary is only a school of training for the full Rosary in the form first* instituted by St. Dominick, and that these associations of fifteen individuals form nothing more than the ante-chamber to the Confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary properly so called, which is endowed with a more abundant fruit of edification, and with a much richer treasure of indulgences and privileges granted by the Sovereign Pontiffs.

THE INDULGENCES GRANTED BY THE APOSTOLIC SEE TO THE ASSOCIATES OF THE LIVING ROSARY.

To gain the indulgences granted on more than one occasion to the Living Rosary sodality, or in future to be granted to it, each

associate has necessarily to be admitted by some legitimate Zelator.¹

It is also necessary that the aforesaid associates use beads blessed in the accustomed way by some priest of the Order of Preachers, or by another priest who has obtained the power of blessing beads from the Right Rev. Master-General of the Order.²

The association of fifteen which, through death, or from what cause soever, loses one or even several of its fifteen associates, does not on that account cease to gain the indulgences, provided that the Zelator supplies new associates in the place of those who are missing, aggregating them within the month which follows the day on which the Zelator gets to know of the death or departure of any member of the fifteen.³

[From this I think it would appear that if a Zelator were to neglect his duty and fail to fill up the gaps in his company of fifteen within a month, both he himself and those unfortunately placed under his control would lose the indulgences. Also I think it probable, from the above paragraph, and also from the language of the paragraph which follows, that if, even after every effort, the number of fifteen associates remained incomplete, any smaller number would not form a legitimate Living Rosary circle, and consequently would have no title to the indulgences attached to the recital of the daily decade. For whatever decade they recited could not, I think, be fairly considered as the *constituta ex pii exercitii praescripto pars Rosarii* designated by Gregory XVI. in his brief *Benedicentes*, which grants these indulgences. The whole meaning of the sodality is to secure the recitation of a *complete* Rosary of fifteen mysteries every day by means of an association of fifteen persons.]

If in any set of fifteen numerically perfect, one or more of the associates, whether through negligence, or from what cause soever, do not recite their decade, the other associates by no means remain deprived of their gain of indulgences; but those associates alone who are unequal to their duty undergo punishment for their infidelity by the deprivation of their privileges and indulgences.⁴

[This privilege, obtained by Cardinal Lambruschini for faithful associates, only applies, we see, to a "set of fifteen

¹ *S. Congr. Indul.*, 2 Feb., 1878.

² *S. Cong. Ind.*, 2 Feb. 1878, and *Supr. Mod. Declar.*, 5 Jun. 1879, and 22 Apr. 1887.

³ *Ex. Aud. SSmi.* 1 Nov., 1835.

⁴ *Ex eadem SSmi.* 1 Nov., 1835, *A. Card. Lambruschini, Prot.*

numerically perfect," thus confirming the opinion I have expressed above about incomplete circles.]

Each of the associates can gain the following indulgences:—

[Following the example set by Dr. Walsh in 1871, I shall exhibit these by means of a table, for the sake of clearness.]

INDULGENCES FOR ALL ASSOCIATES OF LIVING ROSARY.

INDULGENCE.	GRANTED TO THOSE WHO	CAN BE GAINED
1. Plenary.	(a) Are legitimately received into the sodality, and (b) approach the Sacraments of Penance and Eucharist.	Once—on the first feast day after their reception.
2. Plenary.	(a) Say their decade daily for a month, unless hindered by a reasonable cause; (b) go to Confession and Communion; and (c) pray in some church, unless, for a just cause, the Confessor substitute some other work.	Once a year—on our Lord's Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany, Resurrection, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Whit Sunday, Trinity Sunday; all the feasts, small or great, of the B.V.M., SS. Peter and Paul, All Saints. Once a month—on the third sunday.
3. Plenary.	(a) Say their decade for a year on Dominican beads; (b) go to Confession and Communion; (c) pray for the Pope's intention.	Once a year—on any day at choice.
4. Partial. 100 days.	Say their decade on days which are not feast days.	On the day of recitation.
5. Partial. Seven years and seven quarantines	Say their decade on Sundays, Holidays of obligation, or which have ceased to be of obligation, and during the Octaves of Christmas, Easter, Corpus Christi, Pentecost, and of the Assumption, Nativity and Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.	On the day of recitation.
6. Partial. 100 days for every Pater and Ave,	Say their decade on Dominican beads.	On the day of recitation.

ADDITIONAL INDULGENCES FOR OFFICIALS OF THE SODALITY.

INDULGENCE.	GRANTED TO	CAN BE GAINED
1. Partial. 100 days.	Legitimate Zelators and Zelatrices for fulfilling any point of their duty.	Toties quoties.
2. Partial. 300 days.	Legitimate Presidents of at least eleven Zelators, for fulfilling any duty.	Toties quoties.

Moreover, by grant of the Right Rev. F. M. Fr. Cipoletti, Vicar-General of the Order of Preachers, on the 24th of May, 1836, all the associates of the Living Rosary, in the same way as the members of the Confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary, become sharers in all the spiritual goods of the whole Order of Preachers.

[The above is the last paragraph of the official statement.]

T. M. BYRNE, O.P.

THE LIVING ROSARY IN MISSIONARY
COUNTRIES.

UNDER the above heading I stated in the October number of the I. E. RECORD that bishops in countries under the care of Propaganda could empower their priests to establish the sodality of the Living Rosary, without any reference to the Dominican Order. This statement was made in reply to one of several correspondents who "were puzzled" by certain "new doctrines" regarding the constitution of the Living Rosary which had been ventilated in the preceding number of the I. E. RECORD. These "new doctrines," it will be remembered, consisted in the claim put forward on behalf of the General of the Dominican Order, that in him, and in him alone, is vested supreme and entire authority in all that concerns the Living Rosary. Having shown that this claim, as far as missionary countries are concerned, is entirely void of foundation, I ventured to suggest that the writer who made it intended merely "to lay down the general rules relating to the Living Rosary, without taking into account the special circumstances of

this or that particular country." He has not chosen, however, to avail himself of this easy method of escape from an untenable position; and last month he solemnly re-affirms in the pages of the I. E. RECORD that "the legitimate source of authority over the Living Rosary in Ireland resides in the Irish Dominican Provincial, and in him alone."¹

With the utmost respect for this able and zealous champion of the rights of the Dominican Order, I beg to re-assert the exact contradictory of this proposition, and to state again, that the Irish bishops can empower their priests to establish the Living Rosary without any reference to the Provincial or any other member of the Dominican Order in Ireland or outside it.

Here let me premise:—1. That I have never contended that these powers belong to the Irish bishops *de jure ordinario*, or even *quasi ordinario*, but that they are in the technical sense of the word *extraordinary* powers. Now the merest tyro in theological science is aware that powers given to a bishop as a matter of course, are not extraordinary in the technical sense, and that these powers are only given in answer to the petition of individual bishops. Hence, it is quite possible that one Irish bishop, or several, may not be in possession of these powers because they have failed to ask them. My contention, therefore, is, not that each Irish bishop has, as a matter of fact, the faculties in question, but that each of them, by applying to the Congregation of Propaganda, can have them.

2. I never said, or even thought, that the *Instruction* issued by Propaganda in 1889, *communicated* any faculties either "indiscriminately" or otherwise "to all bishops," or to any section of them. But I did interpret it as a proof of the fact that the Propaganda is in the habit of communicating to bishops under its care the extensive faculties mentioned therein. This interpretation I shall afterwards prove to be neither singular nor unsupported.

3. Suppose for a moment that the following statement were true—"the *Instruction* then proves absolutely nothing as

to the fact of the Irish bishops having received these powers from Propaganda;"¹ what would follow? It should follow, we are told, that the Irish bishops do not in reality possess these powers. But is such an inference not quite as illogical as that from *posse* to *esse*, which has been charged to my account? If a certain document does not contain a certain statement, then no other document contains it! or, if a certain individual has wrongly interpreted a certain document, and has used this false interpretation in support of a certain doctrine, the doctrine also must be false, because supported by unsound argument! Granting it proved that this *Instruction* not only does not support my contention, but that it is a base forgery, it would still remain to be proved that the Living Rosary in missionary countries is entirely dependent for its valid constitution on the superiors of the Dominican Order. But all that has been yet attempted—and with what success we shall soon see—is to show that this *Instruction* does not prove that the Irish bishops have received the extraordinary powers claimed for them. Not yet, therefore, are we "in possession of the *fact*, viz., that the Dominican Provincial in Ireland, and he alone, is the legitimate superior of the Living Rosary sodality."

4. I may remark, too, that I did not confine myself to proving that only the Irish bishops possess—in the sense already explained—these powers. What I did prove was that bishops in countries under the care of Propaganda possess them, and the particular proposition regarding Ireland is only an inference from this. The inference, it will be admitted, is a very legitimate one, unless it can be shown that Ireland does not receive the same generous treatment in this respect as other missionary countries. And that we are not treated differently, I inferred from the fact that during the thirteen or fourteen years that have elapsed since the issuing of the brief, *Quod jure haereditario*, no intimation, public or private, has been given to the priests of Ireland by their immediate superiors of any change having been made in the constitution of the sodality of the Living Rosary.

Since, then, my *thesis* was general and included all

¹ I. E. RECORD, Feb. 1891, page 137.

missionary countries, and since my arguments have been questioned, I am bound to conclude that the contention on the other side, is that in no missionary country—unless, perhaps, it be “the wilds of Borneo or Patagonia”—have the bishops, or can they have, independent powers to establish a sodality of the Living Rosary, but must go or send, each time one is to be established, to the nearest Dominican Provincial. Further on I shall show how unwarranted this conclusion is.

5. I am accused of the grave dialectical sin of violating the rule of syllogisms, which strictly forbids the conclusion to contain more than the premises; in other words, I have at one bound, it is said, gone from *posse* to *esse*. Now, as a matter of fact, the section of the *Instruction*, from which I am accused of having drawn the inference that our bishops have received certain powers from Propaganda, and of having thereby committed the sin in question, is not the one from which I drew this inference at all. I quoted that section—the first—for no other reason than that it contained a concise and complete enumeration of the powers usually conferred on bishops by Propaganda. The inference—namely, that bishops in missionary countries receive these powers—I drew from the second and third sections, and it is surprising how anyone can have thought otherwise. I am not, therefore, the dialectical delinquent I have been made to seem.

Having shown that I am innocent of the charge of violating one of the canons of argumentation, I shall show that my accuser himself has made a rather serious slip in this respect. Referring to a statement made in the I. E. RECORD for October last, to the effect that the brief of 1877 has been hitherto unheard of by most priests, he says: “It is not right, then, to say that the brief of 1877 is hitherto unheard of by most priests.” “For,” he adds further down, “the brief of 1877 *has* been heard of by a great many priests.” Therefore, “a great many” and “most” are contradictories; and it is not true to say that most of the people of Ireland are Catholics, because a great many are Protestants!

Having now disposed of these preliminary matters, I shall at once proceed to set forth my reasons for holding, that in missionary countries the Dominican Provincial is not the sole legitimate source of authority over the Living Rosary sodality, and that the bishops of those countries in their respective dioceses, can, without any reference to the Dominican Provincial, empower their priests to establish and carry on this sodality, unless in those particular parishes¹ in which a house of the Dominican Order exists. These reasons or arguments are derived from two sources—(a) from the *Instruction* so often referred to, and (b) from the specific faculties granted to various missionary countries.

With regard to the *Instruction* I feel convinced that the bare text, without note or comment, is enough to establish my position to the satisfaction of anyone who will read it with unprejudiced mind. But, in order to prevent further cavil, I shall briefly point out the meaning of each section, and, as I take it for granted that my readers understand Latin, I shall give them the original text—

“EX SECRETARIA S. CONGREGATIONIS DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

“*Romae die Iunii ann. 1889.*

“ILLME. AC REVME. DOMINE.

“Sacrae huic Fidei Propagandae Congregationi dudum iam antea actis temporibus auctoritas per Summos Pontifices facta fuerat tribuendi Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Vicariis, et Praefectis Apostolicis aliisque Missionum Moderatoribus ab eadem S. Congregatione dependentibus, facultatem erigendi in locis sibi subiectis quascumque pias Sodalitates a S. Sede adprobatas, iisque adscribendi utriusque sexus christifideles, ac benedicendi coronas et scapularia earundem sodalitatum propria, cum applicatione omnium Indulgentiarum, quas Summi Pontifices praedictis Sodalitatibus, coronis et scapularibus impertiti sunt.

“Verum postquam per Decretum Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiarum et SS. Reliquiarum editum die 16 Iulii anno 1887, constitutum est quod Confraternitates SSmae. Trinitatis, B. M. V. a Monte Carmelo, et septem Dolorum, ne eadem erigerentur nisi requisitis antea et obtentis a respectivorum Ordinum Superioribus pro tempore existentibus literis facultativis pro earundem erectione, a nonnullis dubitatum est num praedictum decretum loca etiam Missionum respiceret, in quibus plura rerum adiuncta prohibent quominus quae per illud praecipuntur commode possint executioni mandari.”

¹ *Decr. Authentica*, n. 392.

The first paragraph of this section of the *Instruction* enumerates the powers which the Congregation of Propaganda has authority to confer on bishops under its care. And that this authority, with which the Congregation is endowed, is not permitted to lie dormant, but is exercised in favour of missionary countries generally, the second paragraph makes abundantly evident. For in this paragraph it is stated that a doubt was excited in some minds by the publication, in 1887, of a decree of the Congregation of Indulgences. Now, who were they whose doubts were excited? Why did they doubt? Was it in the minds of the members of the Congregation of Propaganda that these doubts arose as to whether a decree of a sister congregation did or did not curtail their powers? Certainly not. It is not usual, I would imagine, for Roman congregations to make public their doubts or difficulties. Besides what purpose would it serve? They who were moved to doubt by the decree of 1887 were the bishops and vicars-apostolic in missionary countries.

And why did they doubt? Because the Congregation of Indulgences withdrew from bishops power to establish certain confraternities. But if they were not conscious that their faculties with respect to confraternities were uncommon and extraordinary, what ground had they for doubting that they were included in a general decree? They were conscious, however, that the Congregation of Propaganda had communicated to them its extensive faculties; and, therefore, they doubted whether the decree of 1887 extended to them.

This interpretation of this section agrees, or rather is identical, with that given by the learned editor of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, M. Planchard, Vicar-General of Angoulême :—

“On the appearance of the decree of 1887 [he writes] . . . bishops and vicars-apostolic, furnished with powers to erect these confraternities in virtue of formulas from Propaganda, were troubled, and requested the Holy See to declare whether the decree extended to missionary countries.”

“À l'apparition du Décret du 16 Juillet, 1887 . . . les Evêques et les Vicaires Apostoliques, munis du pouvoir d'eriger

ces Confréries en vertu des Formules de la Propagande, se sont émus, et ont demandé au Saint Siège si le Décret s'étendait jusqu'aux pays de missions." (Tome xxi., page 488.)

Some time ago I wrote to M. Planchard, asking on what authority he made this and other statements regarding the present *Instruction*. He promptly replied: "*Ab ipsa S. Congregatione de Propaganda Fide, mediante agente curiae episcopalis Engolismensis in Urbe expostulavi ex obtinui,*" &c.

One word more about this section. The following words are worthy of attention. . . . *dubitatum est num praedictum decretum loca etiam Missionum respiceret.* The doubt therefore was, not whether the decree affected this or that particular missionary country, but whether it affected missionary countries in general. No doubt an attempt has been made to show that the succeeding clause, "*in quibus,*" &c., restricts the general expression, *loca missionum*, to places such as "the wilds of Borneo or Patagonia." But it is as clear as noon-day that the relative clause is explanatory and not restrictive; were it restrictive, the antecedent would not be *loca* simply, but *ea loca*.

The meaning of this section, then, is that the bishops, &c., in missionary countries, possessing the extensive faculties bestowed on them by Propaganda, and enumerated in the first paragraph, and doubting whether they were affected by the decree of 1887, petitioned Propaganda to have their doubts solved.

Quapropter ad omnem ambiguitatem e medio tollendam SSmus. D. N. Leo Pp. XIII in audientia diei 15 superioris mensis Decembris a R. P. D. Secretario praedictae S. Congregationis Indulgentiarum et SS. Reliquiarum habita, declarare benigne dignatus est Sacrum hoc Consilium Propagandae Fidei eisdem facultatibus quoad erectionem Confraternitatum a S. Sede approbatarum uti prosequi posse, quas ante promulgationem praedicti Decreti diei 16 Iulii anno 1887 habebat. In Audientia vero diei 31 superioris mensis Martii habita ab infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretario eadem Sanctitas Sua insuper iussit ut per hanc S. Congregationem, non obstante quavis praevia S. Sedis prohibitione, libera facultas tribui possit erigendi etiam Confraternitates SSmi. Rosarii, ita tamen ut fideles iis adscripta non lucrentur nisi indulgentias communiter concessas omnibus in genere Confraternitatibus canonice erectis."

In this section we are told what action Propaganda took to remove the doubts of the petitioners, and with what result. The result is a declaration from the Holy Father that the powers of the Congregation, and consequently of the bishops whose powers are derived from the Congregation, remain unaffected by the decree of 1887. It is true that only the powers of the Congregation itself are expressly mentioned. But the reason is evident.

There is question here of faculties already granted by Propaganda for five, seven, or ten years. These faculties depend for their validity on the authority of Propaganda to grant them. If that authority ceased with regard to any particular portion of these faculties, the bishops could not thenceforward use that portion validly. Here, then, the Congregation makes known to the bishops that its authority is not in any way affected by the decree which excited their doubts, and, as a consequence, that they (the bishops) can still validly exercise their faculties for the erection, &c., of all confraternities and sodalities approved of by the Holy See. And, as the doubt, as we have just seen, regarded all missionary countries, so do the solution of the doubt and the assurance of the Congregation.

Here, again, I am able to support my interpretation by extrinsic and impartial authority. In addition to the learned writer, already quoted, I can bring forward a witness whose right to be heard on this subject no one can question, as he is, without doubt, the best living authority on all matters connected with confraternities, sodalities, indulgences, &c. I speak of Father Beringer, S.J., Consultor of the Congregation of Indulgences. In a learned work on indulgences, bearing the approval of the above Congregation, this author says—(I quote from the French translation published in 1890, and, like the original, approved of in the most formal manner by the Congregation of Indulgences) :—

“ With regard to missionary bishops who depend immediately on the Propaganda, the Holy Father, in an audience of December 15, 1888, declared that they can still use, as in the past, the very extensive powers communicated to them by the Congregation of Propaganda : that is to say, *in the seat of their missions they*

*have faculties to erect and to enrich with their respective indulgences all confraternities recognised and approved of by the Holy See."*¹

Father Beringer, be it remarked, uses the most general terms—*évêques missionnaires*—in speaking of those in favour of whom this declaration was made by the Holy Father. He does not say that it has been made only to bishops "in the wilds of Borneo or Patagonia, where either there are no religious orders existing, or where communication with the centre of authority would be extremely difficult, if not impossible;" but roundly asserts that it has been made to "missionary bishops," on the general condition, of course, that they make due application. And what is the purport of the declaration? Nothing less than that they can erect and enrich with their respective indulgences all confraternities approved of by the Holy See. After this is it not a little vexatious to hear it solemnly proclaimed that bishops in missionary countries neither have, nor can procure, the power to establish the very unimportant sodality of the Living Rosary?

"Moderatores igitur Missionum huic Sacrae Congregationi Fidei Propagandae subiecti facultates ab eadem sibi faciendas quoad omnium Confraternitatum erectionem, fidelium in easdem adgregationem, scapularium benedictionem et indulgentiarum applicationem, valide et licite exercere se posse sciant quin a quopiam cuiusvis Regularis Ordinis Moderatore veniam aut assensum expetere aut obtinere antea teneantur. Quoad Confraternitates SSmi. Rosarii tamen, si velint eas ita constitutas ut fruantur etiam peculiaribus illis indulgentiis, quae competunt Confraternitatibus erectis auctoritate Magistri Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum, tunc ad eum recursum habeant oportet."

About this section it is superfluous to say a single word. The preceding section, as we have seen, confirmed missionary bishops in the exercise of their faculties; the present

¹ "Relativement aux évêques missionnaires qui dépendent immédiatement de la Propagande, le Saint Père dans son audience du 15 Décembre 1888 a déclaré qu'ils peuvent encore user, comme par le passé, des pouvoirs très étendus que la S. Congregation de la Propagande leur communique, c'est-à-dire dans le ressort de leurs missions ils ont la faculté d'ériger et d'enrichir de leurs Indulgences respectives toutes les confréries reconnues et approuvées par le Saint-Siège."—(Tome 2, page 52, note.)

assures them, that when the time comes for having their faculties renewed, they shall receive the same ample unrestricted faculties as heretofore. Hence, *faciendas*—"the gerundive participle," we are told "employed for lack of a future passive." Here again the terms employed are as general as they can be, "*moderatores igitur missionum*"—not a word here of "the wilds of Borneo, or Patagonia"—the superiors of missions, that is, the bishops and vicars-apostolic in all missionary countries, are to understand, &c. From the faculties here mentioned only one single confraternity—the *Confraternity* of the Rosary—is excepted, and that only partially. Since, therefore, the *sodality* of the Living Rosary is not excepted by the Congregation, is it not a little presumptuous on the part of a private individual, to except it, and to endeavour to lead the public in this and other missionary countries to believe that these same *moderatores missionum* have no power whatsoever over it?

Here is what M. Planchard, a writer already quoted, says on the preceding and present sections of the *Instruction*:—

"It appears to us that the reply of the Sacred Congregation contains two parts—1. With regard to the faculties already received and granted for a regular time (five or ten years), the Congregation declares that the powers remain, notwithstanding the decree, and that those who have received them can continue to exercise them in complete security until the expiration of the time. It is to be remarked that this declaration was made, not because it was absolutely necessary, but *ad tollendam omnem ambiguitatem*. 2. After the expiration of existing faculties the Congregation assures us that the same faculties will be continued."¹

Now, will anyone say that "the *Instruction* proves absolutely nothing as to the fact of the Irish bishops having received these powers from Propaganda?" Unless it be denied that the Irish bishops are *moderatores missionum*, the *Instruction* would seem to prove most conclusively that they have these powers.

But arguments if possible more conclusive and more

¹ *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, loc. cit. The remaining portion of the *Instruction*, having no direct bearing on the present question, I omit it.

convincing still remain. The contention on the other side, as I have again and again emphasized, must be, if there be any logic in the arguments used, that the bishops in any missionary country, which can boast of a more advanced civilization than "the wilds of Borneo or Patagonia," need not hope to receive from Propaganda the faculties which I have claimed for missionary bishops generally; and above all, the faculties for establishing the sodality of the Living Rosary. Now, will it be believed that in the ordinary formula given to bishops in such comparatively civilized countries as England and Scotland the eleventh section runs as follows?—

"Erigendi intra fines suae Dioecesis, exceptis locis ubi adsunt regulares ex privilegio sui ordinis ejusmodi facultates gaudentes, quascunque pias Sodalitates a S. Sede approbatas, iisque sive per se, sive per presbyteros a se delegandos adscribendi utriusque sexus fideles ac benedicendi coronas et scapularia earundem Sodalitatum propriam cum applicatione omnium Indulgentiarum quas summi Pontifices praedictis Sodalitatibus coronis et Scapularibus impertiti sunt."

More extensive faculties than these could not be given. Yet in England and Scotland there are religious orders—there are Dominicans, and even a Provincial—and "communication with the centre of authority is neither quite impossible, nor extremely difficult." And the English bishops actually exercise these faculties, and actually establish the Living Rosary without asking permission of the English Provincial of the Dominican Order, and no prophet has yet arisen to warn them of their error.

New Zealand, too, with its archbishops and bishops, and its several religious orders is not quite sunk in the depths of barbarism. Yet, behold the faculties granted to its *moderatores missionum* :—

"Erigendi Confraternitates Sanctissimi Rosarii, et Scapularis B.M.V. SSmi. Cordis Jesu, Propagationis Fidei nec non alias Confraternitates pietatis ab Apostolica Sede jam approbatas cum applicatione omnium et singularum Indulgentiarum et privilegiorum quae summi Pontifices praedictis Confraternitatibus impertiti sunt."

I have also before me copies of the powers regarding confraternities &c., granted to the bishops of other missionary

countries, and, though not all expressed in the same terms, all are equally extensive. From this fact, and from the tenor of the *Instruction*, I conclude that the Congregation of Propaganda is accustomed to give the same faculties in this particular matter to all bishops under its care. And that all bishops under the care of Propaganda can exercise the powers communicated to them by that Congregation without reference to any religious order whatsoever, the oft-quoted *Instruction* unmistakably declares, no matter what interpretation of it we adopt.

I have now proved the general proposition that bishops in missionary countries can establish confraternities and sodalities approved of by the Holy See without reference to religious orders. Consequently, they can establish the sodality of the Living Rosary without permission from the Provincial or other members of the Dominican Order. Ireland is a missionary country. Therefore, the Irish bishops can establish the sodality of the Living Rosary without reference to the Irish Dominican Provincial; therefore, too, the legitimate source of authority over the Living Rosary in Ireland does not reside in the Irish Dominican Provincial alone. But it may be argued that the Irish bishops do not receive the same treatment from Propaganda in this respect as the other missionary bishops. That, I admit, is not impossible; but it has yet to be proved; and in the face of the facts already brought forward, it will be very difficult to prove it. Why they should receive less extensive powers than the bishops of England, for instance, is not easy to see.

It has been said that the faculties granted by Propaganda to at least one Irish bishop, "are the very same that priests get (though with the right to delegate) for blessing beads, enrolling in confraternities, &c." Now admitting, for the sake of argument, that the faculties granted to this particular bishop are the same as are usually given to Irish bishops, still there is not the slightest doubt, that even with these faculties, they are able to empower their priests to establish the sodality of the Living Rosary, to bless beads for the members, and to enable them to gain all the indul-

gences granted by the Supreme Pontiffs to this sodality, and all without reference to the Irish Dominican Provincial. Here is a copy of the faculties granted to priests by Propaganda :—

“SSmus. Dnus Noster Leo Divina Providentia PP. XIII. referente me infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secrio R. . . facultatem benigne concessit, de consensu tamen Ordinarii, et exceptis locis, ubi adsunt Regulares ex privilegio sui Ordinis eiusmodi facultate gaudentes, ad quinquennium adscribendi utriusque sexus fideles Confraternitatibus a S. Sede approbatis ac benedicendi Coronas et Scapularia earundem Sodalitatum propria, eaque fidelibus imponendi, cum applicatione omnium et singularum Indulgentiarum et Privilegiorum, quae Summi Pontifices memoratis Confraternitatibus impertiti sunt, dummodo non adscribantur nisi Fideles qui praesentes sint in loco adscriptionis.”

When, along with the powers mentioned in this formula, bishops receive power to sub-delegate, they can, be it remarked, empower their priests to enrol members in any confraternity or sodality approved of by the Holy See, and to bless beads, &c., and communicate indulgences. But any priest who can validly enrol members, and do all the other things here mentioned, is *eo ipso* a Director of the particular confraternity for which he has received delegation from his bishop. It follows, then, that even with these faculties, Irish bishops can appoint their priests Directors of the Living Rosary sodality. And a Director appointed by legitimate authority can establish the sodality, can appoint *Zelatores* and *Zelatrices*, can bless beads, and enable the members to gain all the indulgences. Therefore, again, Irish bishops can empower their priests to establish and carry on the sodality of the Living Rosary. And, as their powers, according to the *Instruction*, are independent of all religious orders, it follows that neither the Irish bishops, nor the priests delegated by them, have to apply to the Irish Dominican Provincial for license to establish the sodality of the Living Rosary.

Having now disposed of the main question raised by the publication of these articles on the Living Rosary, I shall take no further notice of any side issues already raised, or

that may hereafter be raised. I have established my position by arguments absolutely unanswerable, and have put it beyond the pale of doubt or cavil, that bishops in missionary countries have power to establish, and to appoint their priests to establish the sodality of the Living Rosary in every parish in their respective dioceses in which a Dominican convent does not exist. Therefore, do I repeat, that "these articles on the Living Rosary, so far as they concern this country, or any country subject to the Propaganda, might as well never have been written; and their teaching need not excite the least uneasiness or anxiety regarding the constitution or working of his Living Rosary sodality in the mind of any priest in any missionary country."¹

D. O'LOAN.

Theological Questions.

QUESTIONS ABOUT FASTING.—THE USE OF LARD AND DRIPPING.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly answer the following questions in the next number of the I. E. RECORD? 1st. Is it lawful on all fast days to use butter; and, if so, how much may be used—I mean at the morning collation? 2nd. Is it lawful for those bound to fast to use oatmeal food with milk for the collation; and, if so, may a little bread and milk be taken also at the same collation? Milk is allowed only by custom in tea, but since permission has been given to use butter, perhaps the milk may also be allowed with the oatmeal food. An answer will oblige, yours faithfully,

"A CONSTANT READER."

1. Butter may be used at the collation on all fast days, with the exception, of course, of black fast days. And as regards the quantity which may be taken, nothing has been specially defined. But we may state in a general way, that butter may be used as an accompaniment with the morning

¹ I. E. RECORD, third series, vol. xi., page 945.

collation on fast days, as it is used with breakfast on non-fasting days throughout the year.

2. "Is it lawful for those bound to fast to use oatmeal food with milk for the collation?" The quantity and quality of food which may be taken at the collation are always determined by custom. Hence we think there is no difficulty about allowing oatmeal food at the collation; because, even if it has not custom to sanction it *in propria forma*, it is so much akin to the food generally used at the collation on fast days, that it may be said to be at least virtually sanctioned by custom. Then, as regards the quantity that may be taken, we may take as our standard the quantity which theologians permit of bread cooked with water and oil. Therefore—(a) a person is not restricted to eight ounces of the boiled meal, which includes, of course, meal and water; (b) he cannot take eight ounces of meal independently of the water with which it is boiled; but (c) he may take four or five ounces of raw meal in its subsequent boiled state, without at all computing the water. We think also that, as butter is allowed as a condiment with bread, so a little milk may be used by those who prefer boiled meal for their morning collation. But as milk is always treated as food, the quantity of milk taken with boiled meal must be included in the eight ounces permitted at the collation.

3. Of course, bread may also be taken, provided that the bread, meal, and milk do not exceed the quantity of food permitted to fasting persons.

4. Another correspondent asks, "whether the faithful may have any hesitation to avail themselves of the privilege granted in some dioceses, of using *lard* or *dripping* as a condiment on all days during the coming Lent, except Ash-Wednesday, Spy-Wednesday, and Good Friday?"

In reply we would say—(a) that the Irish bishops have power to allow the use of lard and dripping to their subjects;¹ (b) that the bishops may restrict the dispensation to the use of lard; (c) that wherever the bishops give permission for both, the faithful may use both; (d) that

¹ I. E. RECORD, third series, vol. ii. (1881), pp. 168, 169.

where a bishop allows the use of *lard* only, it must be understood of swine lard only, and not of the fat of other animals, unless local custom has given a wide meaning to the word; hence in such a diocese dripping may not be used; (e) finally, wherever Spy-Wednesday is not a black fast day, the privilege extends to that day also.

D. COGHLAN.

[We have received a letter from *Alter Sacerdos*, calling in question our decision in a case of clandestinity given in the January Number. We shall publish in our next issue our correspondent's letter with a reply. We are also obliged to hold over other interesting questions, owing to pressure on our space, till next number.—ED. I. E. R.]

Correspondence.

“THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN MACHALE, BY THE RIGHT REV. BERNARD O'REILLY.”—A PROTEST.

“VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—The January publication of the I. E. RECORD contains an able and eloquent critique on the *Life and Times and Correspondence of John MacHale*, the late illustrious Archbishop of Tuam, by Right Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.

“It is to be regretted that Dr. O'Reilly allowed himself to be made the medium of publishing over his name, and perpetuating in an abiding form—thus taking on himself the full responsibility—some gross slanders on living prelates, whose line of conduct in the matters referred to is certainly above reproach.

“Among the several slanders published by him, there is one of a very damaging character relating to his Grace's successor in the See of Tuam.

“In vol. ii., p. 626, it is stated, that on the occasion of the late Archbishop's jubilee, 5th June, 1885, the present archbishop—then bishop of Galway—‘held a spiritual retreat of his clergy on the days of the jubilee, thus preventing them from joining in the solemn celebration with the clergy of the province,’ of whom but comparatively few were present at all. This having been maliciously published in some hostile journals at the time, the good bishop of Kildare, who kindly conducted the retreat of the clergy, at once generously offered to contradict it; but was prevented

by the bishop of Galway, who looked on it at the time as a mere ephemeral matter, hardly worth attending to.

"Now, however, as the slander is repeated in an enduring form, sanctioned by the name of Dr. O'Reilly, it is due to historical accuracy and the vindication of character, that the truth should be fully stated, as is done in the subjoined letter:—

"ST. JOSEPH'S RETREAT, BLACKROCK, CO. DUBLIN,
January 20, 1891.

"MY DEAR LORD,—I remember the slander to which your Grace has drawn my attention, in your letter which followed me from Tullow.

"As you justly aver, the time arranged for the retreat of your clergy was six months before the celebration of the jubilee of your lamented and illustrious predecessor, when neither of us had any idea of the time when the jubilee was to be celebrated. Hence, the base slander that your Grace fixed the time of the retreat for the purpose of preventing your clergy from assisting at the celebration of the jubilee.

"Had your Grace allowed me, as I offered at the time, to contradict this gross calumny, you might have been spared the pain of finding it repeated in Dr. O'Reilly's *Life and Times of Dr. MacHale*.

"As an able critic has well remarked, it is to be regretted that some private and confidential correspondence has been published in a work which I take for granted was intended by its author for the edification of the public. Wishing your Grace every blessing from above, I remain, yours devotedly,

"✠ JAMES LYNCH."

"Dr. O'Reilly would better consult for the memory and reputation of the great and illustrious archbishop, by omitting all allusion to the appointment of a coadjutor. He could afford to allow several reminiscences regarding it to lie dormant. The least we should expect from a priest, not to speak of an impartial historian, would be, to show a due regard for the golden maxim, *audi alteram partem*, before committing to paper what, on due inquiry, he would find to be gross slanders.

"Other similar calumnies shall at present be left unnoticed, owing to the sources from which they emanated. But, should the occasion arise, there are at hand ample materials, and the most convincing written evidences to confute them.

"✠ JOHN MACÉVILLY,

"Archbishop of Tuam.

"ST. JARLATH'S,
January 25, 1891."

Notices of Books.

PRINCIPLES OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND BIOLOGY. By Rev. T. Hughes, S.J. Second Edition. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1890.

A FARMER when dying bade his sons delve industriously for a treasure concealed in his fields. Though they found not the sought-for treasure, their industry was rewarded by a golden harvest from well-tilled acres.

To some such effect did Charles Darwin unconsciously, perhaps, leave his followers and successors in the fields of natural science a secret to be sought for—viz., the far-famed “missing link” in the chain of evolution connecting man with the lower creation. In pursuit of this imaginary treasure precious discoveries have been made in geology and the cognate sciences, but above all in morphology and physiology. The achieved results, especially in the domain of medicine, seem but the early promise of a harvest of discoveries of the most far-reaching beneficence and utility to the human race. Whilst welcoming the noble march of science, and all real human progress, we should not, however, forget the great Master and Author of all, who has said, “My glory I will not give to another.”

Yet such is the perversity of man that the very greatness of the Creator’s gifts are contorted into proofs against His existence or His revelation. In the book before us we have a wholesome antidote against such unfounded and fanciful theories, which appeal so confidently to the researches of modern science for proof and for a basis. The author in the course of four lectures discusses, with severe and trenchant logic, the fallacies of Darwinian theories regarding the origin and descent of man, and the changeful doctrines of modern evolutionists. Ensconced in the easy chair of negative criticism, with no thesis to maintain, the lecturer deals out impartial justice alike to the conscious sophist and to the rash speculator.

The fourth lecture on “Cells or Evolution,” read in the light of recent investigations of Schwann, Pasteur, and Koch, is very interesting, and deals ably with the newest and latest developments of physiological science from the author’s standpoint.

M. K.

REVELATIONS OF THE SACRED HEART TO BLESSED MARGARET MARY. By Mgr. Bougand. Benziger Bros.

AT the present day devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus has become very popular among the faithful, and the literature on the subject has increased enormously within the last half century. Yet we are sure there are few who will regard the present translation of Mgr. Bougand's valuable work as superfluous. Cardinal Manning, Father Faber, Father Dalgairns, and several others have written exhaustively on the subject from some particular point of view; but it is so many-sided that our author has written an octavo volume of four hundred pages without repeating much that is to be found in books already written on the subject.

In eighteen chapters the author deals with a number of very interesting questions hitherto touched but lightly in popular books on the devotion. "The State of the Church in France," "Birth, Childhood, and Youth of Blessed Margaret Mary," "Her Novitiate"—such are the titles of the early chapters, and the subject in each case is treated in a very masterly manner. The story of the youth of the Blessed Margaret Mary supplies most useful and edifying reading—the account of her disposition, weaknesses, temptations, struggles, and final victory. The immediate preparation of her soul for the great work of her life; her extraordinary mortifications; her wonderful spirit of prayer; her exterior trials arising from the prudence or prejudice of her superiors, supply abundant matter for some very interesting chapters.

The chapter headed "The Aurora of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart," treats, as its name implies, of the small beginning and gradual development of the devotion, until the time appointed by God for its public preaching and approbation had come. To many readers this will be the most interesting chapter in the book, for in it the author has collected evidence from the writings of the Fathers, and from relics of early Christian art, to show that devotion to the Sacred Heart was not unknown in the early ages of the Church. The references become more distinct in each succeeding century, until, in the thirteenth, we find St. Gertrude, St. Lutgard, and St. Catherine of Sienna speaking of the advantages of the devotion so clearly that we are surprised it was not then formally approved and preached.

In the remaining chapters the author gives a full account of

the different revelations made to Blessed Margaret Mary ; of the assistance given to her by the Jesuit, Father de la Colombière ; of her holy death ; of the spread of the devotion, and of the blessings derived by the French Church, and the whole Catholic world, from the practice of the devotion.

The work of translation has been admirably done by a Visi-tandine of Baltimore, who has established strong claims on the gratitude of English-speaking Catholics by supplying them with a book containing much that is new on a most important chapter.

SHORT SERMONS ON THE GOSPELS. By Rev. N. Redmond
New York: Pustet & Co. 1890.

IN a compact little volume of two hundred and twenty pages Father Redmond presents us with a course of sermons for the Sundays throughout the year. Written, in the first instance, for the columns of a newspaper, these sermons—short, pithy, and forcible—were well suited to the needs of those who, from one cause or another, had not opportunities of listening to a regular course of instructions. Doctrinal points are discussed with clearness and vigour, and the Scriptural proofs are aptly introduced, and cogently applied.

Exception might be taken to a few forms of expression ; for instance, we read in the sermon for Trinity Sunday :—“ Following this infallible source we are carried back to the creation of the parents of our race, and we hear, as it were, the Triune God say to His three Divine Persons : ‘ Let us make man to our own image and likeness.’ ” Here the conception is false, for it represents the divine nature as a personality distinct from the three Divine Persons.

The moral teaching is solid and practical, and pleasingly conveyed in appropriate and at times really eloquent language.

The volume will prove useful and instructive reading for all, and may be regarded as a fair standard of what is expected of a missionary priest when he turns to address his people on the Gospel of the Sunday.

M. K.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

APRIL, 1891.

THE SPIRIT AND INFLUENCE OF GOETHE.

IT would be difficult to present, in the limited space which the pages of a monthly review can afford, anything like an adequate picture of the life and character of John Wolfgang Goethe. It would be still less feasible to discuss or examine in detail the nature of the influence which he exercised over his countrymen, and which his example and his works still continue to wield, not alone in Germany, but in many other countries beyond its frontiers. The character of the man is so many-sided, he can be viewed from so many standpoints, examined under so many different aspects, that, however one may endeavour to represent him in miniature, some of his most striking features are sure to be left in the background, or to disappear in the process of bringing others into relief. For it has to be remembered that Goethe was not alone a poet remarkably endowed with the richest gifts of nature; he was also a prose writer of the first rank; he was a naturalist who studied with passion all the phenomena of life and of the exterior world which he professed to regard as the only manifestation of divinity that a reasonable man could acknowledge; he studied the anatomy of the human body with such close attention as to make important discoveries which had hitherto escaped the observation of specialists. In his discussions with Cumber and Blumenbach he shaped and enunciated the doctrine of evolution, and supported it with arguments of unquestioned originality. As a botanist,

he was the first to broach to the world the theory which, applied by him in detail to plants only, has since been extended by Haeckel and Darwin to all animated nature. In opposition to Sir Isaac Newton he wrote a treatise on colours. He was a lawyer by profession and a statesman on a small scale. He had mastered whilst still young the French language and literature, had gone through the whole curriculum of Latin, which he understood and wrote well, and had made a special study of Greek poetry and Grecian civilization. There was scarcely anything of importance in art or science, in archæology or history, that did not interest him and attract his notice, whether favourable or unfavourable. Though not professionally a philosopher, a well-defined system of philosophy has been extracted from his works. It underlies his thought everywhere, gives the bent and turn to his mind, and is the key to much that is otherwise obscure and almost incomprehensible in his writings. In addition to this, Goethe was a "man of the world" in the most complete and absolute sense of the words. He lived for life's sake, boldly—*resolutely*, as his biographers tell us, and according to his motto:—

"Im Ganzen, Guten, Wahren resolut zu leben !"

but all the while with very little regard for the standard of integrity or for the notions of right and good which had prevailed amongst honourable men in the world before him.

It will thus appear evident that we must confine ourselves here within narrow limits; yet we shall endeavour to condense in a short space as much as may afford an insight into the complex and original character of this author. We shall record to the best of our judgment the merits of his principal works, and the value which Catholics can attach to the labours of his life, and to the results of these labours in his native land and wherever his influence extends.

Of Goethe's private life we do not care much to speak. It is a subject that has but little attractions for a Catholic. It was a career of sensualism restrained only by the very egotism which spurred it on. It was marked by a series of betrayals in the most delicate relations of life, and by a long

list of false and truculent dealings with friends and benefactors, which, in the minds of honest men, have not unreasonably made the name of Goethe synonymous with selfishness, fickleness, and treachery. But we must not dwell too much on this aspect of his life. There are others which afford a more interesting, if not on the whole, to a Catholic, a more pleasant occupation. We must hear his friends and admirers. We must let his works speak for him. We must even be allowed to join from the outset, and within due limits, in the universal admiration for his genius, for the richness and variety of his nature, for his fertility of resource, for his literary skill, for the depth of his insight into the human heart; and above all, for the life, the tunefulness, the soul which he inspired into his works, and which went so far to make them what they have become—the treasures of a nation and the pride of a great people.

And certainly the Germans have placed Goethe on the very highest pedestal in their empire. Whether the necessities of their new position—the requirements of their national pride—may not have had more to do in working up what is called the “Goethe-Cultus” than the subjective merits of the poet, and a genuine popular appreciation of them, is a question which has secured strong opinions on one side and the other. Having conquered the French, and become a great military power, it was to be expected that they should present us with a national poet to match. All things should be in order and proportion, and the interest in the literary hero, which had commenced to flag before the foundation of the new empire, was now revived and redoubled. Dr. Falk, the famous minister of the “May Laws,” made the study of Goethe an essential part of the national education. A man of learning and ability was found in the person of Professor Hermann Grimm, of Berlin University, to direct the attention of the people to the undiscovered beauties that lay hid in their midst. National modesty did not overburden the professor; for in speaking of *Faust* he tells us that:—“The career of this, the greatest work of the greatest poet of all times and of all peoples has but just begun, and we have been making only the first attempts at drawing forth

its contents." There is another observation of this same professor to which we, at least, are inclined to attach more weight; it is to the effect that:—"Since the days of Luther, no poet, no thinker, has exercised an influence so deep or in so many directions over four successive generations of his countrymen as Goethe."¹

The part that circumstances had in preparing the way for this extraordinary influence, and in pressing it forward once its reality was felt, must not, of course, be left out of sight; but the fact remains; and it is vouched for to us by the unsuspected testimony of one who is, on the whole, perhaps, the most adverse critic that has ever taken Goethe in hands. This learned Jesuit and most recent German biographer of the poet, Father Alexander Baumgartner, admits in sadness the universality of his influence:—

"His works [he says] circulate everywhere; in cheap class books and editions for the people, in fine library volumes, in richly-bound and illustrated drawing-room folios, in special 'editions de luxe,' made up for the gratification of princes and book-fanciers. His songs are sung, his dramas played, his heroes and heroines, himself and his troop of wordly companions, exhibited in the windows and paraded in the streets. Passing under the guise of a great poet and classical writer, presented with the halo of national glory, Goethe has an entrance everywhere, finds his way into every circle of life, and, on account of the charms of his style and the beauty of his language, produces an effect upon every heart."²

Nor, as we have stated, is this influence confined to Germany alone. Since Napoleon Bonaparte carried *Werther* with him to Egypt, and proclaimed that he had read it seven times, Goethe has been, if not a favourite author, at all events the object of close and attentive study with the French people. The recent works of MM. Schérer, Marmier, and Caro, prove that the interest in the German poet is by no means on the decline in France. Of these, M. Caro's work, *La Philosophie de Goethe*, is, by far the most important. We can only indicate here the

¹ Vorlesungen. Berlin, 1877.

² Goethe, *Sein Leben und Seine Werke*, vol. iii., page 435.

spirit in which it is written, which may be judged from these concluding words:—

“If our readers have sometimes found us too indulgent towards Goethe in spite of the metaphysics which condemn his principles, and in spite of the logic which leaves no room for sentiment, we shall bear the reproach lightly. We scarcely need apologize for having shown ourselves sympathetic and respectful before that universality of genius which endeavoured to cope with the universality of things, and which, even though it failed, has left, nevertheless, on the ruins of its effort and on every fragment of its thought, the seal of undoubted greatness.”¹

But we are still more concerned as to how Goethe fared in these countries, and especially amongst the great array of literary men who flourished in the United Kingdom in the early part of this century. Sir Walter Scott came under his influence at the very outset of his career, for his first literary effort was a translation of Goethe's drama, *Götz von Berlichingen*. We shall afterwards see what a deep impression this German drama produced on Sir Walter's mind, and to what use he turned it in subsequent years. Lord Byron also was not slow to do homage to the poet of Weimar. To him he dedicates three of his tragedies—*Sardinapolis*, *Werner*, and *Marino Faliero*. He offers him *Sardinapolis* as the homage of “a literary vassal to his liege lord—the first of existing writers who has created the literature of his own country and done honour to that of Europe;” whilst in the letter which accompanies *Marino Faliero*, he speaks of him as of a man “who for half a century has led the literature of a great nation, and will go down to posterity as the first literary character of his age.” But far greater than the compliment of words is the compliment of imitation, and this Lord Byron fully pays to Goethe “like a vassal to his liege lord” in the *Childe Harold*, in *Manfred*, and perhaps still more strikingly in the *Bride of Abydos*, which opens with an undisguised imitation of Mignon's song in *Wilhelm Meister*,

“Kennst du das Land wo die citronen blühn.”

Moore, who so frequently mentions his name in the *Life of*

¹ *La Philosophie de Goethe*, par. E. Caro, page 327.

Lord Byron, "can only speak of him as *the illustrious Goethe*." Southey, Lockhart, Wordsworth, and Procter send him birthday presents as an acknowledgment of his genius, of their indebtedness to him as their "spiritual teacher," and "in order that," as their joint address has it, "whilst the venerable man still lives amongst us some memorial of the gratitude we owe him, and think the world owes him, should not be wanting."¹ Thackeray writes to his friend, George Henry Lewes, how in his young days he was admitted into the literary circles of Weimar, and how when he returns there after an absence of three and twenty years he finds the "grand old Goethe, the patriarch of letters, serene and majestic as ever."² Bulwer Lytton likens him to "a great reflector, which gathers light from every side, condenses and strengthens it, and then sends it out to shine far and wide over the land."³

But with all this the man who really introduced Goethe to English readers, and made him in these countries "a local habitation and a name," was Thomas Carlyle. The old poet of Weimar was still hale and strong in his eightieth year when the "Sage of Chelsea," then in the freshness and vigour of manhood, first sounded his trumpet of Goethe-worship in England :—

"In this distracted time of ours [he wrote], when men have lost their old loadstars and wandered after night-fires and foolish will-o'-wisps, and all things in that shaking of the nations have been tumbled into chaos, the high made low and the low high, and ever and anon some duke of this or king of that is gurgled aloft to float there for moments and fancies himself the governor and head director of it all, and is but the topmost froth-bell, to burst again and mingle with the wild fermenting mass ; in this so despicable time, we say, there were nevertheless two great men sent amongst us. The one in the island of St. Helena now sleeps 'dark and lone 'mid the ocean's everlasting lullaby,' the other still rejoices in the blessed sunlight on the banks of the Ilme."⁴

¹ *The Life and Works of Goethe*, by George Henry Lewes, page 560.

² *Lewes's Life of Goethe*, page 563.

³ *Caxtonia*, pp. 233, 234.

⁴ *Carlyle's Miscellanies*, vol. iii., page 329.

Carlyle's whole estimate of Goethe is pitched in this high key. He regards him as

"The strong man of his time—a clear and universal man—one who in his universality as thinker, singer, worker, lived a life of antique nobleness under new conditions; and in so living was alone in Europe; the foremost whom others are to learn from and follow. The goal of manhood which he attained, we too in our degree have to aim at. Of him, with a feeling such as can be due to no other man, it may be said, *vixit vivit*."¹

If admiration for Goethe expressed itself thus profusely and unreservedly in times so different from ours, it was, surely, not in the days of positivism and agnosticism openly professed and strenuously propagated that his star was to wane. On the contrary: this is the world in which the poet is truly at home, and his are the writings in which its votaries heartily rejoice. He was made for them, and they for him. As Dante is the philosophic poet of Christianity and Catholicism, so Goethe is regarded as the shining light of what is called "modern civilization," with its pagan theories, its sceptical mind, its corrupt morality. It is, therefore, no surprise to us to find Mr. Mathew Arnold speak of him as "the clearest, largest, most helpful of modern thinkers;" an author who "in the width, depth, and richness of his criticism of life surpasses all modern men."² And, taking for granted what we know, we find it, perhaps, even still more in the nature of things that Mr. John Morley should have "bent the knee to Baal," and made his psalm of life out of one of Goethe's lyrics. There is something so beautifully vague, admitting of such a wide domain of moral latitude, in the grand outlines of conduct which the poet traces that no one can wonder when he finds their author accepted as the prophet of this novel creed:—

"By laws that are iron,
Grand and eternal,
We all must accomplish
Our cycle of living."

¹ *Miscellanies*, vol. iv., page 200.

² *Mixed Essays*, by Mathew Arnold, page 311.

What a comforting doctrine to think that we are the creatures of these eternal and unchanging laws; that no matter how our thoughts may vary, no matter how our surroundings may be recast, there is yet something eternal in us, not ourselves, "that makes for righteousness," that leads us on unerringly to our destiny; that we need only abandon ourselves to the daily task:—

" Like a star
That maketh not haste,
That taketh not rest,
Each one fulfilling
His God-given hest !"

and that all in the end must be *justly* regulated, since nature evolves for ever her compensating economy. It was one of those enthusiastic admirers of Goethe who said that for depth of thought and significance of moral teaching his equal can be found only in the Hebrew Bible. Considering how opposed was Goethe to all supernatural revelation, the contrast is a curious one and betrays a strange attitude of mind. Thoughts that have a real echo in the heart of man, and poetic touches that make the inmost fibres of his nature vibrate, there are in Goethe in abundance; but when it comes to a matter of fundamental belief or of moral teaching, we must be excused if we can discover nothing in the many works of Goethe to remind us of the Hebrew Bible, not to speak of the Greek Testament. But we must not anticipate.

The two earliest productions of Goethe were *Götz von Berlichingen* and *Werther*—a drama or a dramatized chronicle and a novel. These first-fruits of the poet's endeavour are now ranked amongst his minor works, yet they are regarded by many writers as the double source from which flowed two mighty streams—the literature of feudalism and romance,

¹ "God-given hest," which we find in all the English renderings, is not accurate. The original runs:—

" Wie das Gestirn
Ohne Hast,
Aber ohne Rast
Drehe sich jeder
Um die eigne Last."

as represented by Sir Walter Scott and Manzoni, and the literature of passion and sentiment, represented by Lord Byron, Lamartine, and Alfred de Musset.

Gottfried von Berlichingen, surnamed of the Iron Hand, was a famous predatory Burgrave of the sixteenth century, one of the last remnants of the turbulent and lawless race of feudal barons whose personal prowess often shed the lustre of romance over acts of plunder and brigandage. This grim old knight waged unceasing war on his neighbours. He was a loyal and trusty servant of the Emperor Maximilian, but in the intervals of his imperial service he made many a raid and pillaging excursion on his own account.¹ The bishops of Bamberg and Mainz were obliged to arm their followers against his unscrupulous attacks; and sieges of castles, skirmishes in the open field "trenches, tents, and palisadoes," became the order of the day. Compelled at length by the Emperor to desist from his private warfare, Gottfried spent his last years in retirement, and wrote the chronicle of the events of his time from which Goethe drew the materials for his drama. This was the first result of a prolonged study of Shakespeare; for, as Shakespeare explored for dramatic purposes the chronicles of Holinshed and Saxo-Grammaticus, Goethe founded his first venture on the self-related exploits of the Knight of the Iron Hand. But whilst Shakespeare's dramas undoubtedly suggested to Goethe the dramatization of *Götz*, the work of the German poet is, nevertheless, altogether original and un-Shakesperian in construction, in the delineation of character and in the colour of thought. Goethe's object was not, as Lewes remarks, to write a drama, but rather to dramatize a picture of the times. It is from this point of view that his whole project was conceived and all his colours blended; and it is in this sense also that *Götz* became, as it were, the model and forerunner of so many historical novels and pictures in poetry or prose of deeds and times long past. We have already mentioned in this connection the name of Sir Walter Scott; and recollections of *Marmion*,

¹ See Lewes's *Life of Goethe*, pp. 108-110.

Ivanhoe, *Guy Mannering*, *Rob Roy*, *The Bride of Lammermoor*, spontaneously occur to us. The effect which his first literary effort, the translation of *Götz*, produced on Sir Walter's mind is aptly described by his biographer Lockhart:—

“With what delight must Scott have found the scope and manner of our Elizabethan drama revived on a foreign stage at the call of a real master! With what double delight must he have seen Goethe seizing for the noblest purposes of art, men and modes of life, scenes, incidents, and transactions, all claiming near kindred with those that had from boyhood formed the chosen theme of his own sympathy and reflection! In the baronial robbers of the Rhine, stern, bloody, and rapacious, but frank, generous, and after their manner courteous; in their forays upon each other's domains, the besieged castles, the plundered herds, the captive knights, the browbeaten bishop and the baffled liege lord, who vainly strove to quell all these turbulences, Scott had before him a vivid image of the life of his own and the rival Border clans, familiarized to him by a hundred nameless minstrels. If it be doubtful whether but for *Percy's Reliques* he would ever have thought of editing their ballads, I think it not less so whether, but for Iron-handed *Götz*, it would ever have flashed upon his mind that in the wild traditions which these recorded he had been unconsciously assembling materials for more works of high art than the longest life could serve him to elaborate.”¹

Beyond the literary power and originality of the writer, there is, however, but little in *Götz* to reveal the inward nature of the poet. It is only in a passing way that he betrays even here his life-long and inveterate hatred of Catholicity.

The next work of importance was *Werther*, and the sensation which its first appearance created was felt all over Europe. It was the direct outcome of the state of mind and feeling that prevailed in Germany in these days, and in all other European countries, too, where the authority of the Catholic Church had been shaken off. The protest of Martin Luther was being pushed to its ultimate conclusions. The publication of Lessing's *Nathan*, and the *Fragments of Wolfenbüttel*, and the widespread favour with which they were received proved that religion had been wrecked by the

¹ Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, vol. i., page 296.

storm to its very roots. Whilst the last embers of faith were dying out in the Protestant world around him, Goethe was not a mere onlooker. He had his share in what was being done. The German unbeliever thought religion a superfluity. He admitted, indeed, that for the lower classes, and even for governments, it had still some value. It was a great sanction for civil morality, and of considerable use for keeping society in order—at least the ignorant and uneducated, who have not the feeling of honour and duty in full degree; but for the educated, thinking classes the old Christian faith was a reality no longer. They did not scoff at it and mock it with the fiendish malice of Voltaire. They were more refined in their methods. They displayed great learning, took great pains with their arguments; were sometimes, indeed, inclined to levity and sarcasm; but were, on the whole, grave and polite in their irreligion. But the work of the destroyer must end somewhere. The charm of novelty soon vanished from his undertaking, and left the heart of the society he had sought to fascinate empty and dissatisfied, robbed of its mainstay, seeking its good in dulled senses and outward vanity. The result can be imagined. The harmony of life was lost. There was once more something incomplete and unintelligible in existence which no philosophic theory could account for. The struggles of life, the changes of fortune, suffering, and death—all of which fit in so naturally in the Christian system—became what they were to the Greeks of old—puzzles and enigmas. No wonder the cry of Empedocles should have been re-echoed in this new paganism.¹

The sickly sentimentalism which grew up out of these new conditions, and by whose agency, strangely enough, Schopenhauer and Hartmann have swayed so large a section of the most military people in Europe, was then in chaos and confusion. It has since become a philosophic system; not, indeed, formulated and expressed in rules and principles, but jungled together in helpless reflections and tearful aphorisms.

¹ Ω πόποι, ὦ δειλὸν θνητῶν γενός, ὦ δυσάνολθον,
Οἶον ἐξ ἐρίδων ἐκ τε στοναχῶν ἐγένεσθε.
(περι φύσεως.)

In the days of Goethe it was still pent up and confined. It was felt everywhere, but dared not parade itself. It was nourished in morose and silent dissatisfaction. Goethe was the first to open the portals of that melancholy storehouse, and to give public vent and free exit to its contents. He was from personal experience well qualified for the task. During his residence at the law courts of Wetzlar he had made the acquaintance of two secretaries of legation, named Kestner and Jerusalem. He was admitted into the domestic intimacy of the former; received constant hospitality and kindness from him and from his family. He repaid them by upsetting their domestic life, and by introducing them, under names which everyone recognised, into his story on the *Sorrows of Young Werther*. The unhappy Jerusalem had become the prey of the prevalent notions, and after repeated disappointments of fortune and unlucky speculations had put an end to his life with his own hand. All the events of the poet's sojourn here are fused into his story in such a fashion as to give the greatest annoyance and offence to the people who had treated him with such generosity and friendship. The Werther of the story, who is no other than Jerusalem, is mixed up with the Kestners in a manner wholly unwarranted by the facts. They knew little of nothing of him; and yet he is made to move and live in their social and private circles, and to commit suicide chiefly on their account. "Delicacy of feeling is the Eldorado of the poet," wrote Edgar Allen Poe,¹ "and Goethe knew no delicacy of feeling." It was said that his work afforded intense relief; that it was read with avidity by all kinds and classes of readers, who now, at all events, could breathe more freely. The wretchedness that was eating away the heartstrings of a people was so touchingly, so sympathetically portrayed, that innumerable readers are said to have imitated the example of the hero, and to have rid themselves of an existence which had become meaningless and unprofitable. Whilst this is the direct and, apparently, final conclusion which the author seems to arrive

¹See *Atlantic Monthly*, 1877.

at and to commend, and which was so accepted by the multitude when the work first appeared, we are yet informed that such a consummation was far away from the purpose of the poet; that he was still but describing his objective surroundings; and that if we wish to find the counterpart of *Werther*, and to discover Goethe's real cure for the ills he had laid bare, we must seek it in his second and maturer prose work, *Wilhelm Meister*. Without expecting to find in this new arsenal of wisdom any trace of the only remedy which can heal an irreligious world, it should, at all events, be a relief to turn away from a work whose every page

“Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,”

to one which, however deficient from a moral and philosophic standpoint, is, at any rate, positive and constructive in its aims. We must not, however, take leave of *Werther* without recording the judgment which leaves no alternative to Catholics—that the burden of its lesson is essentially anti-Christian; that its moral effect is bad; that it is a work in which religion is ridiculed and vice is held up to imitation and praise, and that its pernicious influence was all the more baneful on account of its charm of style and beauty of language.

Wilhelm Meister is composed of two parts, the *Lehrjahre*, or *Apprenticeship*, and the *Wanderjahre*, or *Traveling Term*. The latter portion was an afterthought, and is not of as much importance as the former. A feature of the story which lends it a special interest is the fact that in its main outlines it is an objective sketch of Goethe's own life. But the direct purpose of the poet is to take a young man by the hand; to lead him through the highways and by-ways of existence; to represent him struggling against difficulties, and surmounting the obstacles to his happiness, till at last he is established by the variety of his experience and the strength of his education, superior to every possible contingency of fate or fortune. This purpose is not openly professed in so many words, but it results from the whole story with all the more effect as it is kept artistically out of view.

Now the world in which this interesting hero circulates is extremely common, vulgar, and corrupt. Niehbuhr called the work "a menagerie of tame animals." It seems to lay before us the every-day experience of life in a certain section of that Protestant society which, having once thrown off the authority of the Church, was not likely long to retain the authority of the commandments. It were well, indeed, if it could only be described as commonplace and vulgar; but, in addition, it is vicious, corrupt, and sinful. And not only is the author apparently not conscious that there is anything objectionable in his pictures, but just the contrary. He admires his hero, and praises him as "a solid Philistine." He is a young man to be imitated. He displays what Goethe regarded as the highest type of perfection—"a rich, manifold life." From beginning to end he lives and moves in an atmosphere of free-thought and libertinism, and when finally satiated with the world he settles down, like Goethe himself, in stoical and satisfied tranquillity. In the unfolding of his conceptions Goethe takes many an opportunity of giving vent to his hatred of monks and priests, of celibacy, of the worship of saints and relics, and of the Catholic practice of pilgrimages. His contempt for the asceticism of Catholic life, so freely expressed elsewhere, is deeply visible here also; for the indulgence of a perverted libertine is crowned with approbation and success. And yet Goethe takes good care to leave no trace of the melancholy of *Werther* on the horizon of this privileged hero. All is sunshine now, determination, strength, indifference to petty troubles. This is, therefore, the road to success. Here lies the direction of modern civilization. Of religion, the chief element which the author thinks important in education, is what he calls *reverence*—reverence for what is above us, or the Ethnic religion, such as was practised in one form or another by all heathen nations; reverence for what is around us, or the philosophical religion, and "what may be designated as the Christian religion;" or reverence for what is beneath us. Of the Christian religion, thus hemmed in and circumscribed, we get an example of what is probably common enough in the Protestant world, viz., a half mystic, half benevolent

lady, who tends the poor and sick, and who according to the fits and starts of her disposition spends her time in the service of the lowly and neglected. Yet in this picture of "a beautiful soul"¹ there is no trace of the high, supernatural motive which calls our Catholic sisterhoods to their works of mercy, and maintains them through the unfaltering devotion of a lifetime.

As in most of the poet's other works, there are, of course, here also pearls amid the husks—pearls of thought, of language and of verse; but, all things considered, the inspiration is from below, and the weight of the teaching corresponds. That it is true to nature we can well believe, if that nature be confined to the REFORMED Church and the revolutionary world; but that it is more calculated to tarnish and corrupt than to edify and strengthen, is the verdict of all who examine it from a purely Christian standpoint.

In religion and philosophy, Goethe was essentially a sceptic. He was on that account open to impressions from all sides, and the variety of his poetic excellence is largely due to these. But whilst an eclectic so far, and especially in art, there is, undoubtedly, in his works an undercurrent of thought which, if it does not amount to an absolute belief in the doctrine of Pantheism, would, at all events, seem to be entirely cast in that direction. His early predilection for the writings of Spinoza; his lifelong worship of nature; the general tendency of his philosophical reflections and conceptions of character; his innate pride and confidence in himself, all go to show his attachment to the Pantheistic creed.

"Nature [he writes] ever surrounds and encloses us. We live upon her bosom, and are yet strangers to her. She speaks to us, and yet keeps her secret. We act upon her, and have yet

¹ "Bekentnisse einer Schönen Seele."

² Natur! Wir sind von ihr umgeben und umgeschlungen . . . Wir leben mitten in ihr und sind ihr fremde. Sie spricht unaufhörlich mit uns und verräth uns ihr Geheimniss nicht. Wir wirken beständig auf sie und haben doch keine Gewalt über sie : . . Die Menschen sind alle in ihr und sie in Allen . . . Er freut sich an der Illusion. Wer die in sich und andern zerstört, deise straft sie als der strengste tyrann. Wer ihr zutraulich folgt, den drückt sie wie einkindan ihr Herz . . Sie hat keine Sprache noch Rede, aher sie schafft Zungen und Herzen durch die sie

no power over her. All men are in her and she in all. Whosoever opposes her is punished as by a tyrant; who follows her in confidence she takes like a child to her bosom. She has no language, no speech; but she creates tongues and hearts, through which she speaks and feels. She is everything. She rewards herself and punishes herself; rejoices and is sad. She is rough and smooth, lovely and horrible, powerless and all-powerful. All is ever there in her. Future and past she knoweth not. The present is her eternity. She has brought me forth, and she shall take me back again. I confide myself to her. Let her dispose of me. She cannot hate her work. What is true and false, all hath she spoken. All is her fault, and all her merit."

The leading characters of Goethe's conception—Prometheus, Faust, Mephistopheles—are all worked into this theory. The inward, latent, philosophical idea of the poet is mirrored in them. This is particularly noticeable in *Faust*; for if ever there were a subject based on strong Christian belief, it was surely that one. And yet, in Goethe's extraordinary poem, or drama, or comedy, or combination of all together, the conception of Mephistopheles is far more in harmony with the Neoplatonic theory of the emanation of evil from the one universal substance than with our Christian notions of the fallen angel; and, if we penetrate beneath the surface, the portrait of Faust himself is as different from the real character, such as he is faithfully depicted by Marlowe, and such as he was understood in his own country and time, as it well could be. The grotesque and comic scenes in *Auerbach's Cellar* and the *Witches' Kitchen* are meant to catch the fancy of the crowd, and in so far to maintain the popular notion of the evil one and the legendary reality of *Faust*; but in the *Walpurgis Night*, and especially in the "Second Part" of the great poem, the popular view of these personages gives way entirely to

fühlt und spricht . . . Sie ist alles. Sie belohnt sich selbst und bestraft, sich selbst, erfreut und quält sich selbst. Sie ist raub und gelinde, lieblich und schrecklich, kraftlos und allgewaltig. Alles ist immer da in ihr. Vergangenheit und Zukunft kennt sie nicht. Gegenwart ist ihr Ewigkeit . . . Sie hat mich hereingestellt, sie wird mir auch heransführen. Ich vertraue mich ihr. Sie mag mit mir schalten. Sie wird ihr Werk nicht hassan. Was wahr ist und was falsch ist, alles hat sie gesprochen. Alles ist ihr Schuld, alles ist ihr Verdienst.—(Goethe's *Werke* "Naturwissenschaft im Allgemeinen," vol. v., page 1.)

Goethe's own philosophical conception of them. It is not that the poet is obliged to widen his horizon in order to introduce into the masterpiece of his genius all his notions on politics, philosophy, art, science and religion; but nature—eternal nature, vivifying all things, penetrating all things—must admit of nothing above and beyond her. It is in the same spirit that the poet celebrates in the “Second Part” the magic nuptials of the Grecian Helen, evoked from the silent night of the past, with Faust, the child of the modern world. With her the classic art of paganism is wedded to the poetry and music of our time, and the spirit of that ancient civilization, passing over the barbarism of the dark ages, is to become once more the inspirer of social, political, and artistic progress. It must be said in justice to the poet that at the last scene—the salvation of *Faust*—the artist does violence to the philosopher; or, in the words of Louis Veuillot, “the conquering instinct of beauty becomes victorious:” and the proud, the cold-hearted, the worldly Goethe, pays his part of the universal homage to the queen of all inspiration, to her whose pure and tender presence had its charm even for this hardened sceptic, and to whose compassionate nature we owe the most beautiful verses and the most heavenly thoughts to be met with in the whole poem. The prayers addressed to that

“Transcendent maiden,
With mercy laden,”

have something in them of the solemnity of the *Dream of Gerontius*, and would form a fitting epilogue to a nobler and more spiritual work.

We have only been able to indicate the general tenor of Goethe's thought in so far as it bears on fundamental belief and the ground-works of morality. There are sayings of his—epigrams, frivolous and sarcastic utterances on the Divine Person of our Lord, on the symbol of our redemption, and on many practices of our worship—which we should not care to quote. They are too blasphemous for repetition. Fr. Baumgartner tells us, with documentary evidence, how Goethe entered the Freemason craft, and what part the lodges took

in spreading his fame and setting him up as a prodigy in the literary world, because he was the spokesman of their ideals, the herald of their revolutionary projects. That much of his fame was thus fictitious, and that his name was paraded and his works belauded for other than their real, or even fancied merits, there cannot be the slightest doubt. At the end of his three volumes of exhaustive analysis Fr. Baumgartner declares :—

“Whoever undertakes a careful and earnest study of his works must acknowledge that he is far indeed from being the greatest of poets. It would be as untrue to say that Goethe surpasses, as an epic poet, Homer, Virgil, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Milton, Tasso, Camöens, as it would be absurd to place him on a level, as a writer of dramas with Sophocles, Shakespeare, Lope de Vega, Calderon, or Schiller. As a novelist, he will scarcely hold a place with Cervantes, Walter Scott, or Manzoni. As an author of comedy, he will not bear comparison with Aristophanes or Molière. The same distance that separates modern culture from the civilization of the middle ages in its ideal aim divides Goethe’s *Faust* from the world-poem of Dante . . . A world-poem, in the true and full sense, *Faust* is not, and can never be. There is wanting in it for that, what is altogether necessary—the presence of a just, a holy, and an all-wise God—of the mediator between God and men—the Word made Flesh—of the Apostles, the martyrs, the virgins. Its round of human affairs is not carried on under the providence and majesty of heaven. There is nothing in it of the triumph of the Almighty over the powers of darkness; no punishment for evil; no reward for good. It shows the road to error and to sin, but not the way out of them; it mixes faith and unbelief, truth and falsehood, morality and immorality, in a medley of chance and confusion, which gives the ultimate victory to evil. Goethe brings back the spirit of the eighteenth century, the spirit of Voltaire and of the Encyclopædists, after its tour of the world, tired of doubt and dissatisfied with itself, into the cathedrals of the middle ages; yet not to pray, not to believe, but to let loose, even in the holy place, the arid spectre of rationalism, and to find for its ideals of the natural order pictures and figures that speak to the heart, tones and melodies, poetry and art, which the world, say what it will, must look for and find in Catholicism alone.”¹

And what the same distinguished author says of *Faust*, he

¹“Goethe, *Sein Leben und Seine Werke*, von Alexander Baumgartner, S.J., vol. iii., page 423 and foll.

extends with almost unqualified severity to the poet's works in general:—

“He preaches unbelief and immorality not so openly, so audaciously as Voltaire, Wieland, and the new French naturalists; but mildly, winningly, almost under cover, in harmless guise, with a mixture of the good and true, or rather of the half-good and half-true. He thus undermines the faith and morality of youth, gradually, almost imperceptibly. If the poison of his heathen principles is not to permeate yet wider circles, it is high time that all who possess an influence over the young, and especially those who are intrusted with their education, should become alive to the danger, and unite their forces in order to avert it.”

This warning is nothing stronger than that of the late Cardinal Hergenroether, who speaks of Goethe in almost similar language in the second volume of his history of the Church.

It may be, and is to Catholics, a matter of regret, that great gifts and undoubted genius should have been turned to such bad account; but, at the same time, it cannot but be a subject of congratulation and triumph that all this is the growth and outcome of the great religious rebellion of the sixteenth century, and that whilst Voltaire and Goethe have gone the way of Luther and of Calvin, of Apion and of Celsus, of the Gnostics and the Manichaeans, the Church, which has outlived their attacks, still prospers and proceeds, strong in the experience of the past as in the consciousness of the future, that her enemies cannot prevail.

J. F. HOGAN.

THOUGHTS ON THE NATURE OF GOD.

“Causa primera de todo
 Sois, Señor, y en todo estais
 . . . No escribe la tierra
 Con caractéres de flores
 Grandezas vuestras?” &c.

CALDERON.

“Certe hoc est Deus, quod cum dicitur, non potest dici; cum æstimatur, nos potest æstimari; cum definitur, ipse definitione crescit.”—S. GREG. NAZ.

ALTHOUGH reason, alone and unaided, is sufficient to inform man of God's existence: although even the untutored savage and wild barbarian may find in this visible and material world proofs and arguments enough of His divine presence, yet, neither reason nor revelation can make clear and intelligible to us the intimate nature and attributes of that Supreme Being whom the Scriptures remind us “no man hath seen at any time.”

Nor is this to be wondered at. Even of created beings, how extremely limited is our knowledge! Even in respect to the visible tangible world about us, how very little it is that we really know! What can the wisest philosopher, the profoundest scientist, the subtlest metaphysician tell us—I will not say of God—but of man; aye, or even of the simplest and most insignificant creeping thing that man crushes without a pang beneath his feet?

What, indeed, do we understand by life itself? What really *is* that mysterious, invisible, immaterial, energizing principle within the body of a man, which keeps the heart beating and the blood ever coursing, year after year, through artery and vein, for the better part of a century or more? What is that strange power animating our fragile house of clay, which, though spiritual and immaterial itself, yet sees through corporal eyes, hears through corporal ears, acts through corporal organs, and loves and languishes, and labours and lives, in an earthly body? Though it abides within our own fleshy frame, yet we know not what it is.

Nothing could be more closely bound up with us, or more intimately united with us, for it is the chief part of ourselves; yet, near as it is, we can neither understand, nor explain, nor form any accurate notion of it even to ourselves.

Nay, more: life *in any form whatsoever* involves mystery. The life and power of movement even in an animal or an insect must pass away from our notice unexplained. We stand and gaze at the industrious spider deftly spreading its gauzy net on some waiving bough in the airy ocean of the sky; we marvel at the beauty of the web, and at the regularity of its geometrical form, and the delicacy of its gossamer threads; we are charmed and captivated at the ease and dexterity with which its author binds strand with strand, and weaves together the curious complicated structure. Yes, all this we can do. But when we begin to ask "how," and "why," and "by what impulse," and "under whose direction" these delicate and beautiful operations take place—well, we find ourselves proposing questions which a child might, indeed, ask, but which neither you, gentle reader, nor I, nor any living man, will ever be able really to solve—at least in this world. Life, in all its multitudinous forms, is girt about with mystery. The acorn, germinating in the ground, and stirring, as it were, from slumber, to awaken into life, is full of wonders. Watch any simple seed as it builds up some graceful form of waving plant or blushing flower out of the rude materials that lie around it, and think how hopelessly inexplicable is the process. Whence come the delicate green stalk, the tender leaves, the unfolding buds, and opening chalice-cup, so exquisitely wrought, so skilfully pieced together, so admirably poised and balanced, and scattering sweetness with every movement, as from some swinging censer? Whence comes this gorgeous apparition of glowing colour and dazzling splendour; this vision of beauty, that fails to startle us, only because so frequently beheld? From what secret repository has it drawn the colours to paint the corona, and the gold to gild the cup?—colours and tints which not even a Raphael d'Urbino nor a Titian can hope to reproduce. A few weeks ago nothing was to be seen here but a dark and barren stretch of earth,

and on it we let fall a seed. Nursed by the warm sunshine and balmy winds, and fed by the dew and rains, it was successfully ushered into active life; and now, contemplate the beauteous object which that seed, like some skilled architect, has planned and constructed out of the dull unconscious earth—a crimson rose, or, perhaps, a tiger lily. Who will explain the secret vital power in the germ? Who will sit down and narrate to us how the various elements were selected and brought together, and transformed and arranged, and adjusted in such perfect symmetry through the agency of that silent and simple seed? A gigantic and hopeless task, indeed! Scientists, botanists, and horticulturists may, indeed, give names to the different processes; but then, to give a name, is not quite the same thing as to explain. No! the truth is, we may see, we may wonder, we may admire the many mysteries of life in the commonest wayside flower or shrub; but to give them or any one of them an exhaustive explanation is as impossible as to create them. That surpasses the power of man.

But if we are baffled by a shrub or a flower; if our proud intellect staggers and positively reels on its seat, when striving to grasp and fathom the lowest and most imperfect forms of created life, how, in the name of common sense, can we expect to unravel the mystery of the divine life of God, without beginning and without end, the source and author of all being? How, indeed, shall we gaze into the fathomless abyss of His incomprehensible perfections “who only hath immortality, and inhabiteth light inaccessible, whom no man hath seen, nor can see, to whom be honour and empire everlasting. Amen”? (1 Tim. vi. 16.)

We possess no faculty whereby we can measure any single one of His divine attributes. Some faint notion may be formed of goodness, of wisdom, of truth, &c.; yes, of *created* goodness, wisdom, and truth; but not of goodness, wisdom, and truth, as they exist in God; for in Him each attribute is absolutely infinite and uncreated—not a quality, but identical with His substance and being, and wholly indistinguishable from it. And our finite minds can no more

contain the Infinite, than time can contain eternity, or a part the whole.

Nevertheless, although the goodness of God is infinitely above our comprehension, yet, that He is good, is clearly seen in creation. The creation also proclaims His wisdom. It is seen in the order and regularity of the measureless heavens; it is made evident in the times and seasons observed by the countless stars, as they hurry on in their courses through the trackless realms of unmeasured space; and, in fact, in all things, great and small; even in the faultless symmetry and elegance of the tiniest organic structure, such as the limb of a microscopic animalcule, or the mouth, masticatory organs, stomach, or alimentary canal of the Rotifera, or what are popularly known as the Wheel animalcules. And what we assert regarding the goodness and wisdom of God holds good also of His power, patience, and mercy, and all else of which creation speaks to us. "For the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made: His eternal power also and divinity." (Rom. i. 19.)

There is another truth, however, related to the inner life of God, which is not by any means so clear and manifest in creation: a truth which, in fact, cannot be positively demonstrated from the contemplation of visible things, although (as we hope to show in a future paper) all visible things in some measure reflect it—and this truth God Himself has therefore been pleased to reveal directly. We need scarcely remark that we here refer to the adorable mystery of the ever-Blessed Trinity—perhaps of all mysteries the most difficult and incomprehensible. We may state a truth, however, without understanding it. Just as we may say that an oak-tree will grow from an acorn, though we can in no way understand *how* it grows, nor unravel any one of the manifold mysteries of its organic development, so we may also state, and state accurately, the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, while, at the same time, we confess our inability to fathom it. And, what is more, we accept it, not as scientific men accept a theory or a supposed discovery, *i.e.*, because we think it reasonable, or because it fits in with our

preconceived notions and opinions, but simply and solely because God has designed to reveal it to us.

Let us begin by stating the doctrine. In a previous article (I. E. RECORD, August, 1890) we dwelt upon the unity and simplicity of God. We called attention to the great central fact at the base of all supernatural religion; viz., that in nature God is absolutely simple and one; and that there is no other God but Him. "I am the Lord, and there is no God beside Me." (Is. xlv. 5.) Now, being but one in nature, we may readily infer that He would be solitary and without any community of thought, unless He were more than one, at least in some respect. Throughout the whole realm of existing, or even of possible, creatures, there is not one that could furnish a really worthy or adequate object for God's contemplation, knowledge, or love. Between Him and them there is no proportion; in fact, all things, including men and angels, are in His dread presence as though they were not. What, then, formed the object of God's thoughts, the object of His contemplation, and the object of His love for all eternity? Absolute solitude is, even to our way of thinking, utterly incompatible with absolute happiness. What, then, broke, so to speak, the eternal silence, and relieved the unspeakable solitude of God? He Himself tells us. He reveals the secret of His life. He informs us that, though His nature is absolutely one and indivisible, that yet this nature is common to three.

Though there is but one God, nevertheless, there are in this one God three totally distinct and different Persons; viz., God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.¹ All three possess not a similar, but the selfsame nature. The Father is truly God, the Son is truly God, and the Holy Ghost is truly God; yet the Father is not the Son, and the Son is not the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost is neither Father nor Son: yet each is God, and there is but one God. The divine nature is not *divided* between the Persons; each possesses it in its integrity and fulness: yet the divine nature is not multiplied, but one and indivisible.

¹ Consult *A Manual of Catholic Theology, based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik."*

The divine nature is the same in each, and differs only in the manner in which it is possessed. The Father has it *from none*; the Son has it *from the Father*; the Holy Ghost receives it *from Father and Son*. Yet the Father retains while He gives; and the Son receives, though He always had, and never began to have, but like the Father and the Holy Ghost is changeless and immutable. Though there is a relation of son-ship, and of father-hood, and of procession, yet these are relations not of time, nor of dependence, nor of inferiority, but relations of procession, or of origin.

The Father is not more ancient than the Son, nor the Son than the Holy Ghost. The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, and the Holy Ghost is eternal; but there are not three eternals, but one eternal. So, in a similar way, though the Son is born of the Father, He is not inferior to the Father, but equal and consubstantial with the Father: His equal in glory, majesty, power, sanctity, and wisdom; and in nature one with the Holy Ghost.

The Father is omnipotent, infinite, and omniscient; the Son is omnipotent, infinite, and omniscient; and the Holy Ghost is omnipotent, infinite, and omniscient: yet there are not three omnipotents, infinites, and omniscients, but only one infinite, one omnipotent, and one omniscient.

The three divine Persons, possessing the selfsame nature, are inseparable though distinct. Where the Father is, there is the Son, and there is the Holy Ghost—so that one Person by reason of His divine nature must ever be accompanied by the other two.

Let us illustrate this by reference to the human nature of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is God. In Jesus Christ, therefore, there dwelt, in inseparable unity, the Father and the Holy Ghost. It was not the divine *nature* which became man. Had the nature of God become man, the Father and the Holy Ghost would be true man, as well as the Eternal Son. But since it was not the *nature*, but the *person* of God, and not the three Persons, but only the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity that was made man, the Father is not man, nor the Holy Ghost, but *only* God the Son. But though neither Father nor Holy Ghost

became man, they both are inseparably and eternally united with the man Jesus Christ, who as God, is one with them, and by His divine nature and essence indistinguishable from them.

Hence, in the Sacrament of the Altar, there is present not only Jesus Christ, but the Father and the Holy Ghost—and when we receive the Blessed Sacrament the very being and substance of the omnipotent God enters into our souls, and with His substance the three distinct but inseparable divine Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

“The inseparable connection of the divine Persons with one another is brought about in the most perfect manner by their relations of origin. The produced Persons (*i.e.*, the Son and the Holy Ghost) cannot even be conceived otherwise than in connection with their Principle (the Father), and, being the immanent manifestation of a *substantial* cognition and volition, they remain within the Divine Substance and are one with It. (Page 338.) “The producing Principle, likewise cannot be conceived as such, and as a distinct Person, except inasmuch as He produces the other Persons.” “The divine Persons constitute a society unique in its kind: a society whose members are in the most perfect manner equal, related, and connected.”

There is, to use technical terms, perfect circumincession, or comprehensive interpenetration, so that

“Each Person penetrates and pervades each other Person, inasmuch as each Person is in each other Person with His whole essence, and possesses the essence of each other Person as His own; and again, inasmuch as each Person comprehends each other Person in the most intimate and adequate manner by knowledge and love; and, as each Person finds in each other Person His own essence, it follows that it is one and the same act of knowledge and love by which one divine Person comprehends and embraces the other Persons.”¹

The doctrine here recalled to the mind of our readers is, of course, absolutely inexplicable and incomprehensible. To try really to fathom it is to try with finger and thumb to pluck the stars from the vault of heaven, or to hold the vast Pacific Ocean within the hollow of our hands.

¹ For a fuller summary of the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, in English, see *A Manual of Catholic Theology, based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik,"* by Wilhelm & Scannell,

Still, even this profound mystery may be, in some weak shadowy way, imaged forth and illustrated by creatures. Some notion of it, at least—however unworthy and incomplete—may be obtained (by way of analogy) by the study and contemplation of earthly things, and above all, and before all, by a thoughtful consideration of the soul of man, created, as it is, to the image and likeness of its Maker. To develop and explain these most wondrous and interesting adumbrations of God's triune nature in His works will require an entire article, so we must defer their consideration to another occasion. In the meantime we may conclude by considering *why* God is pleased to reveal to us the incomprehensible truths of His own mysterious Being.

There are, no doubt, many good reasons. In the first place, that, knowing Him better, we may love and serve Him better. In the second place, that, growing more conscious of the infinite gulf that separates God from all that is not God, we may be filled with an ever-increasing and deepening awe and admiration of Him, before whom the very pillars of heaven tremble, and the angels themselves veil their faces. Another reason may be, in order that we may the better enter into the past eternal life of God, and understand how He could be supremely happy and exercise to the full the activities of His being, independently of all creatures.

But, passing over these and many other reasons that might be suggested, let us dwell for a few moments on what is, perhaps, the most practical one of all.

God reveals mysteries to man, in order to exercise him in obedience, to force him to submit his highest faculty to divine authority, and to subdue his proud rebellious heart and humble his conceit. For consider, the intellect is the greatest and the grandest natural gift of God to man. *That* it is which raises him so far above all other visible beings: *that* it is which sets the crown upon his head and the sceptre in his hand; and, in a word, makes him the monarch of the earth, the lord of the creation. In many respects man is forced to acknowledge irrational creatures his superiors. For instance, in strength he must yield to the lion and the ox; in endurance,

to the patient ass ; in unflagging industry, to the " busy bee." The eagle surpasses him in keenness of vision ; the swallow, in agility ; the deer, in nimbleness and speed of foot ; the hare, in acuteness of hearing ; and so on of the rest. Yet, in spite of all this, man is able by reason of his intellectual parts to assert and to retain his supremacy over all. He can subdue the strongest, capture the fleetest, and entrap the most cunning. All visible things become his servants, and await his bidding. The lightning is his messenger ; steam his obsequious slave ; the rivers and watercourses his beasts of burden. The world, in a word, is at his feet, and he is lord of all. And why is this ? Again we answer, because God has endowed him with reason ; because he possesses intelligence. Now, since intelligence is a gift from God, and held in dependence on God, God very rightly insists that man should acknowledge the gift, realize whence it comes, and pay fealty for it ; and since it is the *highest gift*, it is of the *highest importance* that this acknowledgment should be made.

In a word, man must submit his intellect to God, just as every other faculty of his being. He must bow down his proud spirit, and yield his judgment and personal convictions to the teaching of divine authority. In fact, just as obedience is nothing more than the legitimate service and homage of the free-will, so faith is nothing else than the legitimate service and homage of the intellect ; and the more difficult and obscure, and apparently contradictory and impossible, is the doctrine proposed, and the more completely it throws us upon the rock of God's veracity, the more perfect and meritorious is the act of submission, and the more profound the honour and reverence paid to God.

In these days true faith is rare, because men are eaten up by intellectual pride. Science, or what passes for science, is the idol of the hour. " What I understand," says the scientist, " that I accept ; and what I fail to understand, that I as promptly reject." " What my reason approves, that I believe ; and what my reason cannot attain to, I most emphatically refuse to believe." Such men read and lecture, and

study and teach, and are listened to with such patient trust and humility by their followers, that at last they flatter themselves that they know all things; or, at all events, that they are in a position to investigate and pass judgment on every truth. They have measured the ocean, and weighed the earth, and counted the stars. They will offer to tell you anything you may choose to ask them, from the length of the sun's diameter and its cubic contents in yards, down to the number of vibrations of a fly's wing per second, or the mode of progression of an amœba through a water-drop. Hence, having mastered so much, they insensibly begin to fancy that there is nothing that they cannot master. Indeed, we are all apt to forget the extremely limited range of our minds, and God recalls the fact to us, and humbles our pride by putting before us truths, such as that of the Blessed Trinity, which we cannot possibly hope to unravel or explain, and by commanding us to accept them or suffer the penalty of eternal death. Who is not a true child of the Church will fret and chafe under the ordeal, and, perhaps, even reject the doctrine altogether, refusing to submit his judgment even to God Himself. If, on the contrary, he be a dutiful subject, he will rejoice at such an occasion of testifying his unbounded trust in God, and throwing himself on his knees in the dust will feel happy in exclaiming with a deep sense of his own nothingness:—

“Thou, O Lord, art all light, and I am all darkness; Thou art infinite and uncreated wisdom, I am but pride and folly. I bow down myself before Thee, and submit readily, cheerfully, and without hesitation to Thy teaching. Thou alone art the Lord, Thou alone art God, and there is none like to Thee in heaven or on earth. Thy voice is as sweetest music to my heart, and Thy words are a path to my feet; speak, for Thy servant heareth.”

We cannot honour God more than by trusting Him and confiding in Him, and the more sublime and exalted are the truths He proposes, the more thoroughly do we testify and prove the genuineness of our confidence by believing them.

God may, indeed, try us. He may test our faith as He

tested the faith of Abraham ; He may exercise us continually in this fundamental virtue. One thing, however, He cannot do. One thing is impossible even to the omnipotent God himself—He cannot deceive us ; He cannot mislead us, nor draw us into error, for He is the absolute truth. Heaven and earth may pass away, but His word shall *never* pass away.

JOHN S. VAUGHAN.

PROFESSOR STOKES ON THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH.—II.

“ Faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast
To some dear falsehood hugs it to the last.”

Lalla Rookh.

THE “ dear falsehood ” of an ancient Irish Church, independent of—nay, hostile to—Rome, has for Professor Stokes a fascination akin to that which enchanted the dupes of the Veiled Prophet. Perhaps the professor may not dare death for his delusion as readily as the poor Ghebers did for their’s ; but he is quite prepared to argue for it. He clings to it, upholds it in the face of facts that would shake the confidence of the boldest of men. And it is not to the quality of his logic that the professor owes his confidence, for his logic, like his “ general knowledge,” is very loose, indeed. He finds, for instance, certain traces of resemblance between early Irish monasticism and the monasticism of the East, and he at once concludes that Irish Christianity must have come from the East, and not from Rome. He finds in Gaul some stray orientals, one of them “ a Syrian woman,” who sympathized with St. Columbanus in his trials, and he again concludes that Gaul, too, must have got its faith directly from the East. The professor would find at this moment a considerable Jewish colony in Cork, and would, no doubt, be led by his inexorable logic to conclude that there is an intimate connection between Bethlehem and the

“Beautiful City.” And all this fine logic is employed in order to show that Irish Christianity was at first, and continued for some centuries to be, independent of Rome; that the Roman primacy formed no part of the creed of the early Irish Church; and that, consequently, the Irish Catholic Church of to-day is not the legitimate descendant of the Church established here by St. Patrick.

In the I. E. RECORD for last December it was shown, by evidence which Dr. Stokes will find it difficult to break down, that the Roman primacy did form part of the system introduced by St. Patrick into Ireland. And there is evidence equally conclusive that St. Patrick’s spiritual children adhered to the faith and traditions which he gave them. Professor Stokes thinks differently, and he appeals to the immediate followers of St. Patrick—the early Irish saints—as witnesses against the claims of Rome. The period covered by the lives of St. Columbkille and St. Columbanus was, he tells us, “the golden age” of Ireland’s history; and as these saints were the great lights of that age, they are consequently his principal witnesses. But, on his own admission, Columbkille affords him very little aid. “In Columba’s life,” he says, “there is not one trace of the Pope, or the slightest acknowledgment of his claims. There is silence, however, and this is at most only a negative argument.” (*Celtic Church*, page 147.) On this so-called argument, the only thing that need be said is, that Professor Stokes himself has repeatedly said that it is a bad argument—is, in fact, no argument at all. It would be easy to find in St. Columbkille’s life evidence of doctrines which would startle the members of the Church to which Dr. Stokes professes to belong. The severe penances, the long virgils, the masses for the living and for the dead—celebrated, too, at the early dawn of morning—these are practices which the *General Synod* would repudiate as unmistakably Roman—doctrines that have always been inseparably bound up with the system of which the Pope is the head.

But the professor’s champion witness is clearly St. Columbanus, whose “ecclesiastical position,” he says, “has been a great *crux* for modern Ultramontanes.” Perhaps it

may turn out to be a much greater "*crux*" for the professor himself. He says :—

"Did time permit, we might devote, and with much profit, a whole lecture to consider the ecclesiastical position of Columbanus. It has been a great *crux* for modern Ultramontanes. . . . In the life of Columbanus there is many a mention of the Pope, and several epistles to Popes, but there is also an express rejection and denial of their claims."

He then gives an extract from the letter of St. Columbanus to Gregory the Great on the Paschal question, from which he says "the unbiassed student can draw his own conclusions." The extract is this :—

"How is it that you with all your wisdom ; you, the brilliant light of whose sanctified talents is shining abroad throughout the world, are induced to support this dark Paschal system ? I wonder, I confess, that the erroneous practice of Gaul has not been long since abolished by you. . . . You are afraid, perhaps, of incurring the charge of a taste for novelty, and are content with the authority of your predecessors, and of Pope Leo in particular. But do not, I beseech of you, in a matter of such importance, give way to the dictates of humility or gravity only, as they are often mistaken. It may be, that in this affair, a living dog is better than a dead Lion' (or Leo). For a living saint may correct errors that have not been corrected by another greater one." (*Celtic Church*, pages 147, 148.)

And the impartial professor, who will permit the "unbiassed student to draw his own conclusions," anticipates the student, and gives his own conclusion thus : "I do not think that the reverence of Columbanus for the Pope, or his belief in Papal Infallibility, can have been very great when he would use such language."

It would be charitable to Professor Stokes to assume that he never saw a complete copy of the letter on which he comments so confidently. Indeed it is more than probable that this university professor, lecturing to the future lights of Irish Protestantism, did not go beyond King's *Primer of Ecclesiastical History* for his information. The professor's extract, as far as it goes, is, word for word, the same as King's. The asterisks occupy the same position in both extracts. This is a suggestive coincidence. But even in this garbled extract, what is there to warrant the comment

of Dr. Stokes? "Papal Infallibility" is in no sense whatever affected by the extract; and if Dr. Stokes thinks the contrary, then he does not know what Papal Infallibility means. Neither is the language of the extract disrespectful to the Pope; and the charge comes strangely from one who accounts for one of St. Patrick's visions by saying: "Evidently the poor man's digestion was out of order, or he had fasted too much." (*Celtic Church*, page 90.) And even the extract itself recognises the *very power* which it is adduced to disprove. "I wonder, I confess, that the erroneous practice of Gaul has not been long *since abolished by you*." After St. Columbanus had been for some time in France, the French bishops took exception to his custom of celebrating Easter, and called on him to conform to their custom. He declined, and appealed to Pope Gregory the Great. Now the very fact of the appeal is a recognition of Papal supremacy, and the language of the letter expresses that recognition in the clearest terms. The letter begins thus:—

"To the holy Lord, and Roman Father in Christ, the grandest ornament of the Church, the fairest flower of all the Churches of Europe, the watchman set on high, the guardian of the divine treasury," &c.

Dr. Stokes did not quote these words for his hearers. The saint continues:—

"It seems to me, O holy Pope, that it is not out of order to ask you about the Pasch, according to the canticle: '*Ask your father, and he will show thee; thine elders, and they will tell thee.*' It would be out of place, and out of order, that anything should be referred to your great authority, as if to argue with you, and that my letters from the west should be a worry to you, lawfully sitting on the chair of Peter, the bearer of the Keys."

Neither did Dr. Stokes quote this passage for his hearers. And after the words garbled by Dr. Stokes, St. Columbanus says:—

"Therefore in favour of me a poor feeble stranger, rather than one presuming on his learning, send hither the support of your decision, and disdain not readily to send the authority of your clemency, and so restrain this storm that rages around us."

The saint then asks for directions on certain other

matters, and expresses a wish that his health and cares would permit him to go to Rome, to take in wisdom at its source. And he concludes thus :—

“ My heart’s desire is to give thee due honour. It was mine to appeal to thee, to ask thee, to beseech thee : thine not to refuse the favours sought for, but to let out thy talents, and to give at the command of Christ the bread of doctrine to him who seeks it, Peace to thee and thine. Pardon, I beg of thee, O holy Pope, my presumption in writing thus freely, and even once in your holy prayers to our common Father pray for me a most vile sinner.”

Neither did Dr. Stokes quote these passages for his hearers. It would be difficult for St. Columbanus to express more forcibly his belief in Papal supremacy, to express more clearly his reverent affection for the Pope and for his sacred office, than he has done in this letter. And yet all this Professor Stokes has suppressed. His hearers were young men saturated with anti-Catholic prejudices, and not overburdened with knowledge; and this teacher who is “pledged to be fair and truth-telling,” who “panders to no prejudices,” gives them a groundless comment on a garbled extract from a most important historical document; thus most effectually shutting out from their minds the light of truth. Dr. Stokes may call this teaching history; but any right-minded person must regard it as a flagrant instance of gross controversial dishonesty; which brings down the university professor to the theological level of Mick M’Quaid. In the letter under consideration there is nothing that can be tortured into an argument against Papal Infallibility; there is much in it that clearly favours that doctrine; there is nothing disrespectful in its language or tone; and if the language were much stronger than it is, the saint’s own apology for his “presumption” would have atoned for an outburst of zeal, which, if excessive, was manifestly sincere.

Dr. Stokes does not quote from the letters of St. Columbanus to Pope Boniface, though he attributes to them “an express rejection and denial of papal claims;” and he ridicules Montalembert for “striving to explain them away.” Certainly he himself *could not* explain them away in any

sense compatible with his own theory; and possibly for this very reason the letters are not quoted. The letters of St. Columbanus to Pope Gregory did not reach their destination, and hence the controversy with the French bishops remained undecided. He accordingly wrote to Boniface IV. as follows:—"To the holy Lord, the Apostolic Father, the Pope, Columba, a sinner, wisheth health." He tells the Pope that he has been for a long time most desirous to see "the occupants of the Apostolic Chair, who are most dear to all the faithful, and most revered, because of their apostolic dignity;" but he has been unable. He adds:—

"Saluting you, as in duty bound, *to you alone*, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, we present our petition, that you may grant to us, weary pilgrims, the solace of your paternal decision, whereby you might confirm the tradition of our fathers, if *it be not against the faith*, and so by your decree enable us to observe the Paschal rite, as we have inherited it from our fathers."

Nothing can be clearer than the profession of Papal supremacy contained in this letter. The saint in his difficulty appeals to his "Apostolic Father" for a decision that may enable him to retain his own custom, notwithstanding the prohibition of the local bishops. And the appeal is couched in language of unquestionable orthodoxy. The concession is demanded only on condition that it is not against the faith; which implies that if the Pope regarded the concession as against the faith, Columbanus would abandon his ancient custom and submit to the adverse decision. When he asked the Pope for a decision he must have held that the Pope was competent to decide; that he had authority over both parties to the dispute; and his appealing to the Pope *alone* implies that, in the belief of Columbanus, the Pope had authority in the matter which no one else had—that is, supreme authority. How very different is his style in addressing the French bishops assembled in Synod. To them he writes:—

"I pray you by our common Lord, and adjure you by Him who is to judge the living and the dead, that you will, in the spirit of peace and charity, let me live in silence, in those woods,

beside the bones of seventeen of my brethren already dead . . . Let us, I implore of you, be content to live together here in Gaul as we are destined to live together in the kingdom of heaven if we be found worthy."

This is the language of one who would not surrender his liberty on insufficient grounds, and whose profession of submission to the Pope must, therefore, have been prompted by an imperative sense of duty. In another letter, addressed to the same Pope Boniface, St. Columbanus expresses, if possible, more forcibly his belief in the supremacy of the Pope. This letter was written about A.D. 613, after the saint had settled at Bobio, and referred to the controversy on the "*Three Chapters*." He found circulating in Northern Italy certain gross calumnies on the Popes, with reference to this controversy, and he requests the Holy Father so to exercise his apostolic authority as to silence the calumniators. The letter begins thus: "To the most beautiful Head of all the Churches of all Europe, the beloved Pope, the exalted prelate, the pastor of pastors." And after apologizing for venturing to write, he says:—

"As a friend, a disciple, a scholar, and not as a stranger, do I write, and therefore will I speak freely to our masters, to the guides and mystic pilots of the spiritual ship . . . For we all Irish, dwelling at the ends of the earth, are the spiritual children of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of all the disciples who wrote the divine canon through the influence of the Holy Ghost. None of us has been a Jew, none a heretic, none a schismatic; but we have kept the faith in all its purity, such as it was first given us by you the successors of the Apostles."

He then says that according to the calumniators the Pope receives heretics, which he says: "Far be it from me to believe that it ever has been or ever shall be true." He says: "I myself, with the feeling becoming a disciple, have promised on your behalf that the Roman Church shields no heretic." And he then calls on the Pope to justify this his boast, and to silence the calumniators by "condemning and excommunicating all who dare to asperse the chief seat of orthodox faith." The saint adds: "We are, as I said before, bound to the Chair of Peter. For though Rome is great and renowned, it is because of that chair alone that she is great

and renowned with us." And after referring to St. Peter and St. Paul in connection with Rome, he says: "If it can be said on account of these two Apostles you are almost heavenly, and Rome is the head of the Churches of the world."

In the course of this long letter St. Columbanus, who evidently wrote under a feeling of great excitement, uses very strong language, for which he asks pardon by anticipation, saying: "If in this letter . . . you shall find expressions that are unbecoming, prompted by ill-regulated zeal, attribute them not to pride, but to my indiscretion." But these "unbecoming expressions," for which the saint thus apologizes, do not in any sense take away their meaning from those passages in which he gives such empathic expression to his belief in the supremacy, and in the other prerogatives of the Pope.

Such were the sentiments of this great light of our early Church. One would almost think that he was specially inspired to record his testimony against the calumniators of later times. In the whole range of patristic literature there is no clearer evidence in favour of Papal supremacy than that which he supplies. And with all this before him (for he has it in King's *Primer*), Professor Stokes does not hesitate to say that "the ecclesiastical position of Columbanus has been a great *crux* for modern Ultramontanes." On the professor's own shoulders the crushing weight of that *crux* falls. Like the Jewish prophet of old, who blessed the hosts of the Lord when brought out to curse them, St. Columbanus professes his filial reverence and love for that Father whom Dr. Stokes would have him to dishonour, to repudiate; and he anathematizes the heresies which Dr. Stokes would have him to defend. The professor ridicules the explanation given by Montalembert of some strong expressions of St. Columbanus, though in the very letter that he is misrepresenting that explanation is anticipated by the saint himself. He professes again and again his liberality, repeats often his pledges to be "fair and truth-telling," to "pander to no prejudice;" but in the face of all these pledges we find him studiously suppressing those clear, unmistakable statements of the saint's belief and teaching, and seeking by unworthy controversial

tactics to make him responsible for doctrines which he would have spurned with all the fiery energy of his great soul. What a pity that a professor, with a character for moderation, should so far forget the responsibility of his position ! If the young theologians of Trinity have any confidence in his teachings, they will carry from his lecture-hall false views on some of the most important facts of history. It is much to be feared that few of them will take the trouble of testing the accuracy of his statements, but will rather go their various walks in life filled with the prejudices they have imbibed from his teaching, and will be influenced by these prejudices in their intercourse with their Catholic neighbours. To be "fair and truth-telling" *in theory*, is all very well ; but to give practical proof of it would be much better. Ireland has suffered sadly from historians of the type of Professor Stokes.

Now, even though we had not St. Columbanus' own words for his belief in Papal supremacy, we have indirect evidence that is equally conclusive. The bishops of Gaul certainly held that doctrine when Columbanus appeared amongst them. If Dr. Stokes has any doubt on this matter, let him consult the letters of Pope Gregory the Great. Now, if St. Columbanus appeared amongst these bishops as an opponent of Papal supremacy, how can Dr. Stokes explain the silence of the bishops on this subject, in their controversy with him ? They censure him for his Irish tonsure, and his Irish custom of celebrating Easter, and for these only. Now, can it be maintained that the bishops would, in their attack, confine themselves to trivial matters of discipline, and pass unnoticed his soul-destroying heresy, if that charge could be brought against him ? To use Dr. Stokes' own words : " Why did they make so much fuss about such a trumpery matter as the proper method of calculating a date," and make no reference to his alleged " express rejection and denial of Papal claims " ? There is but one answer consistent with common sense and fact. No such charge could be made against him. On the question of Papal supremacy, Columbanus and his opponents were agreed.

The professor's treatment of the Paschal controversy

forms, perhaps, the most extraordinary chapter in this extraordinary book. It was, he says, "a trumpery matter;" and yet it is treated as if it had been a test question of belief in Papal supremacy. The adoption of one side in the controversy shows that "then, as still, the heart of Ulster remained sternly anti-papal;" whilst, when Munster adopted the opposite side, "no formal Roman connection or supremacy was thereby established." There is no arguing with such a logician. "Even though vanquished, he can argue still." But, unfortunately for the professor, his views are repudiated by the disputants on both sides. There is no necessity whatever for going into the long and complicated history of the controversy. It is sufficient here to say, that the Irish used the eighty-four years' cycle which St. Patrick brought from Rome. In the interval, the inconvenience of this cycle had been recognised at Rome and elsewhere, and a different cycle had been adopted. The Irish adhered to the custom of their fathers, until public attention was drawn to the matter by the presence of St. Augustine with the new Roman custom in England, as well as the presence of Columbanus with his Irish custom in Gaul. Now, there is abundant evidence that the Irish disputants on both sides recognised the supremacy of the Pope. The celebrated letter of St. Cummian on the question is a monument to the great learning of its author, as well as to the faith of the Irish Church in his time. He was a monk of the great monastery of St. Columba at Durrow, and the brethren of his Order were the great champions of the Irish custom. St. Cummian himself had adopted, and strenuously advocated, the Roman custom, and for so doing was severely censured by his brethren at Iona. In self-defence, as well as on the general question, he wrote his letter to Segienus, Abbot of Iona, A.D. 634. In this letter he shows a full mastery of all the bearings of the question. He says, that when he became aware that the Roman cycle was introduced, he did not adopt it, nor did he condemn it. He applied himself diligently to the study of the question. He discusses the various calendars and cycles, the statements of Greek and Latin Fathers, as well as of Irish saints. He traces the controversy through various

councils, and insists on the unity of the Church, both in faith and discipline, as a conclusive argument for uniformity of practice in celebrating Easter. He quotes St. Jerome's letter to Pope Damasus as to the divisions caused by the Arian heresy; and adopting St. Jerome's words, he says:—

“An old authority rises up against me, but I in the meantime cry out, ‘*Whoever is united to the Chair of Peter, with him shall I be.*’ If, then, I cry out with St. Jerome, the great interpreter of Scripture, the great scourge of heretics, I am attacked by you. If I do not so cry out, I am cut off from the universal Church, which has received from God this power of binding and loosing.”

He then alludes to the absurdity of supposing that Rome and all the Churches of the world should be wrong, and the Irish and Britons alone right. He adds:—

“I now turn to the words of St. Gregory, the Pope received alike by you and me, and one, who, though he has written after all the others (quoted) is deservedly to be preferred to them. . . Having studied the question for a year, I (according to Deuteronomy, ‘*I have asked my fathers to announce to me, my elders to tell me*’) asked *my fathers*—the successors of our first fathers, Albeus the bishop, Kieran of Clonmacnoise, Brendan, Nesson, and Luigid, what they thought of our excommunication by the above-named Apostolic Sees. And they having met together in *Magh-Lene*, some in person, and others by their delegates, decreed and said: ‘Our predecessors, as we know from reliable witnesses, some of whom are still living, others resting in peace, enacted that we should humbly and without scruple, receive, as better and more preferable, those things that were approved by the source of our baptism and our faith, and offered us by the successors of the Lord's Apostles. After this, they in common, addressed to us, as is customary, a mandate, that in future we should celebrate Easter with the Universal Church.’”

St. Cummian next says that a difficulty arose, which the Irish bishops met then as they would meet a like difficulty now:—

“In accordance with a synodical decree, ‘*that when more important cases arose they should be referred to the chief of cities,*’ our superiors sent wise and humble men, as children to their mother, some of whom, having through God's will a prosperous journey reached Rome, and returned to us the third year, reporting that all things were as we had been told.”

The Irish deputations saw “Greeks and Orientals, and

Syrians and Egyptians," celebrating the Pasch together in St. Peter's Church, and on their return home they announced "*throughout the whole world, the Easter is, as we know, thus kept.*"

This testimony of St. Cumman is conclusive as to the belief of the Irish of his time in the supremacy of the Pope. In accordance with their own Canon Law, they appealed to the Apostolic See, as children to their mother, for guidance in a difficulty, and in the same filial spirit they accepted the instructions given them. And this testimony is doubly important, inasmuch as it proves not only that the Irish then believed in Papal supremacy, but also, that the doctrine was handed down to them from the great saints who had gone before.

In the closing stages of the controversy, the great champion of the Irish custom was St. Colman of Lindisfarne. In A.D. 664, Oswin, King of Northumberland, invited the advocates of both customs to discuss the question in his presence at Whitby. Bede gives the history of the conference (*Hist. Eccl. Gent. Ang.*, b. 3, c. 25). St. Colman defended the Irish, St. Wilfrid the Roman custom. St. Colman had in reality no argument but the sanctity of Columba and the other Irish saints, from whom he had inherited his custom. St. Wilfrid admitted the sanctity of Columba, but contended that if he had known it, he would have followed the custom of the universal Church. He then quoted the words of our Lord to St. Peter, as proof of the Pope's right to legislate for the universal Church, adding that Colman and his associates would be certainly guilty of sin if they in the present case refused to submit. Now, whatever may be thought of the arguments of Wilfrid and Colman, this, at least, is clear from Bede's interesting narrative—that on both sides, the words of our Lord to St. Peter were taken as applying also to Peter's successors, and as proving that the primacy of Peter descended to them. Wilfrid quoted the words to prove the binding force of the decrees of the Apostolic See. St. Colman did not admit that any Papal decree condemned his own custom, which was followed by so many saints; but he must have

taken our Lord's charge to Peter in the same sense as Wilfrid did; otherwise he could easily, and certainly would, have defended his cherished custom by denying the transmission of the primacy from Peter to his successors. He, on the contrary, admitted it, as is clear from Bede's text, and "all present, great and small, gave their assent." Thus, then, the opposition to Rome, proved (Dr. Stokes fancies) by the Paschal controversy, is a phantom of his own imagination, repudiated expressly by both parties to the controversy.

There is one other remarkable document bearing on the relations of the early Irish Church with Rome. It is the celebrated canon of St. Patrick making the Apostolic See the ultimate tribunal of appeal in cases of special difficulty that may arise in Ireland.

"Moreover, if any case of great difficulty shall arise, and which the various judges of the Irish nation cannot decide, let it be properly referred to the See of the chief bishop of the Irish (that is, of Patrick), and submitted to the examination of this bishop. But if such a case cannot then be easily settled by him and his wise men, we have decreed that it shall be sent to the Apostolic See; that is, to the Chair of Peter, having the authority of the City of Rome."

While treating of the relations of the early Irish Church with Rome, Professor Stokes, with characteristic candour, completely ignores this canon. He quotes it incidentally in favour of the primacy of Armagh, and carefully omits to show its more important bearing. But even here he completely misrepresents it. He infers from it, that "Armagh was then . . . the chief See, and *final* court of appeal for the churches of the Scottish nation." (*Celtic Church*, page 333.) This is manifestly false. According to the canon, Armagh was the court of appeal in the *first instance*; but the *FINAL court of appeal* is the Apostolic See of Rome. Again, Dr. Stokes says: "This canon seems to me conclusive on the point of the precedence, authority, and dignity of the See of Armagh." Well, then, if an appeal from the other Irish churches to Armagh proves that Armagh has authority over these churches, surely an

appeal from Armagh to Rome, as the canon decrees, must prove that Rome has authority over Armagh and all its subordinate churches? This canon is contained in the *Book of Armagh*; but Professor Stokes would, if possible, rob it of the antiquity implied in its incorporation with that venerable book. In a note he says:—

“The existence of an entry in a volume like the *Book of Armagh* does not prove such entry coeval with the earliest portion of the book. It might be centuries later . . . The Queen’s name is written on the fly-sheet of the *Book of Kells*.” (Page 332.)

Now Professor Stokes could have seen for himself, or could have learned from O’Curry, that this canon is written in “*that part of the same old MSS. which was copied from the book written by St. Patrick’s own hand.*” (Curry’s *Lectures*, page 372.) The transcript was made not later than A.D. 807, from an original which was then so old as to be all but illegible. Moreover, the canon was quoted at the Synod of Magh-Lene (A.D. 630), as we learn from St. Cummian, who was present there. Now this canon proves that the Irish at that early date accepted Papal supremacy, otherwise they could not regard the Apostolic See as the *final* court of appeal. An appeal is to a higher authority, and the last appeal must, therefore, be to the authority that is supreme. Now, accepting from Professor Stokes, that the Irish have always been most tenacious of their traditions, we may well conclude that the belief in Papal supremacy—already an old tradition amongst them in A.D. 630—must have come down from our national apostle. And thus Mr. Whitley Stokes does not at all make too liberal a concession in saying that there is no reason for doubting the authenticity of this celebrated *canon*. Now, how are we to reconcile the professor’s treatment of this *canon* with his repeated pledges to be “impartial,” “fair, and truth-telling”? Why did he not explain it impartially to his student, when discussing the matter of which it treats? It would establish beyond doubt the teaching of the early Irish Church—perhaps of St. Patrick himself—on a most important and vital doctrine. Why, then, pass it over? The professor has a theory to maintain, and no evidence can be permitted to disturb it.

He wanted to impress upon his hearers that the early Irish Church had no connection with Rome—was hostile to Rome—and so while any little circumstance that would seem to favour this theory is quoted and exaggerated, all the evidence (and it is overwhelming) against it is systematically ignored. These are discreditable tactics; and he who has recourse to them, while boasting of his impartiality, reminds us of a certain other gentleman who, in an ecstasy of devotion, thanked God that he was not like the rest of men.

It would be a waste of time to follow the professor any further through the confused] mass of trifles and contradictions that make up his two volumes. He is not quite certain when the "Romanising" of the Irish Church began; nor, indeed, when the process was completed. He is quite sure that English influence brought on Roman domination, royal supremacy, *congé d'élire*, and tithes, and so necessitated the Reformation. And yet, strange to say, royal supremacy and tithes were not reformed, but rather continue to be fundamental articles with the theological brethren of Dr. Stokes. Had he even a moderate knowledge of his subject he would not have risked his reputation in such a forlorn hope. The work of "Romanising" Ireland was perfected by St. Patrick, and ever since it has been maintained by his spiritual children in all its freshness and beauty. Untarnished by time, it has survived centuries of lying, hate, and wrong; it is not likely to be affected now by the pranks of Professor Stokes. His work is a failure, a miserable failure. On the subject of his lectures he has cast no light—rather, indeed, a good deal of darkness. There is a great parade of learning, reference to obscure authors implying an immense amount of erudition; but it differs as much from real scholarship as a review of militiamen does from the charge at Balaklava. Sydney Smith knew "a gentleman of the law who had a thorough knowledge of fortifications, and whose acquaintance with bastions and counterscarps and parallels was perfectly astonishing." The witty parson thought that the gentleman in question who piled up this "enormous load of ill-arranged facts," while he neglected the special studies of his profession, "only lowered himself

in the estimation of every man of understanding." What would he think of the Trinity College Professor of Ecclesiastical History? Dr. Stokes carries about with him "a load of ill-arranged facts," not closely connected with his professional duties. He knows a good deal about the "Land League," "Moonlighters," and "Connaught bandits;" he can talk confidently of the "Suez Canal," the "Round Towers," and the "Battle of Carrickshock;" he knows all about the Tectosagae, the "refreshments" of the Galatians, and the ancient "games of Ancyra:" he knows, in fact, something of everything except ecclesiastical history.

J. MURPHY, C.C,

THE LIVING ROSARY IN DETAIL.—III.

THE WORKING OF THE SODALITY.

WITH regard to the practical question of the working of the sodality, I think it well to insist upon the *ends*, primary and secondary, towards which the whole organization is directed, and that a healthy and normal movement will be secured by adopting whatever means the judgment of local directors may decide upon as best calculated to promote these ends. Apart, however, from all questions of local exigencies, there remains a good deal to be said in general as to these ends and means.

In the first place, the primary end of the organization is, without doubt, to promote as far as possible the devotion of the Most Sacred Rosary. Seeing that we are saved by faith, and that the Rosary is, perhaps, of all forms of devotion, that most eminently calculated to bring the entire body of the truths of faith before us, it has been prized in all ages of the Church since its institution, as a method of popular instruction. Now, the Living Rosary is only a less complete form of imparting such necessary knowledge. What the Most Sacred Rosary teaches the individual, the Living Rosary teaches collectively to an association, in order that the

piecemeal knowledge acquired by associates may stimulate them to the work of contemplating *all* the truths of faith in their entirety. Now this, I think, should be kept continually before the minds of the members of the association, so that it may really be, for many of them, an introduction to that powerful aid to salvation, the great Confraternity of the Most Sacred Rosary. It is well to bear in mind that they can become members of the latter without deserting the former. There are many special indulgences granted to the Living Rosary which are not granted to members of the confraternity as such; so that it would be very bad policy indeed, for an associate to give up his sodality on joining the confraternity. They can be exhorted, then, to aspire to the recitation of the *entire* Rosary, without any fear of disruption of the ranks of the sodality.

But they must not be allowed to fall into the mistake that the Living Rosary is, in itself, a perfect work, in which they may be expected to rest without going further. The Living Rosary is, to a certain degree, *incomplete*, because for a whole month at a time it only proposes for consideration *one* of the fifteen great mysteries of our Redemption. If the members, as is permitted by No. 17 of the decrees, follow in their monthly assignation the natural order of the mysteries, it would take a year and a quarter before the mind of any individual had been occupied by all of them. If the lottery system, as prescribed by No. 16, be adopted, then the chances of an individual member having *all* the truths of faith explicitly proposed to him, would, as is evident, be very small indeed. These are the defects of the Living Rosary as a devotion, which it would not do to close our eyes to on account of certain perfections which it possesses. The Living Rosary itself is only what M^{me}. Jaricot intended it—a means to an end—and that end is the complete recitation by the individual of the fifteen mysteries of the Most Sacred Rosary.

Such, then, is the primary end of the Living Rosary devotion. As to the means to secure its fulfilment, I can propose none better than that the people should be carefully, minutely, and frequently instructed to perform the devotion

in an intelligent manner. They should have the meaning of each of the mysteries explained to them; the duties and virtues taught therein should be made clear to them; they should be instructed how to apply the teaching of each mystery to their own peculiar circumstances, so that they may be able afterwards by themselves to draw all the hope and consolation and religious stimulus from them which, in this hard life, they stand so much in need of. Then, and then only, will the people appreciate the beauty and the utility of this heaven-sent devotion, which, from its two characteristics of sublimity and simplicity, is so eminently adapted to satisfy the cravings of the great mass of humanity; and then, too, will the happy priest find that he has gained a firm and unshaken hold upon the hearts of his people, and that of him may be said what Father Aylward sings of St. Dominick:—

“With those Aves, first and plainest
Of the Church’s prayers, thou rainest
Blessings on the earth, and gainest
Souls whom Jesus made.”

If we wish to gain a lasting hold upon the hearts of our people, we must, first of all, firmly grasp their intelligence; we must be plain and simple with them; and then, when we have awakened their ideas, we must show them how the child-like prayers and child-like teaching are a sublime bond of perfection which unites them by faith with a Father Who is in heaven.

This end of the Living Rosary sodality is, no doubt, extrinsic to it, though it is, at the same time, undoubtedly the primary end of the organization. We must now direct our attention to that which is intrinsic. This is the aggregate of spiritual advantages to be gained without ever going outside the sodality; namely, the gaining of indulgences, and that general tone of piety, which is the result of systematic co-operation in any good work. What, then, are the means to be adopted here? Without any doubt, systematic co-operation. The sodality will not work itself; it is only a machine, and a non-automatic one: it must be worked. Here there is a good deal to be said.

In the first place, I would suggest that something equivalent to a "Charter" of the sodality should be displayed in the meeting-room, which would put everyone on a clear understanding as to the meaning of the sodality—its *locus standi*; any secondary objects aggregated to it, the duties and advantages of the members. It might take the form, perhaps, of a large printed card, suspended at the church door, in the sacristy, or meeting-room, which would contain a brief statement¹ as to the object and constitution of the sodality, the diploma of the Director, Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 of the decrees, the full list of the indulgences, and any local legislation made by the Director, authenticated by his signature.

In the second place, if the sodality is to flourish, it is of the very greatest importance to hold a monthly meeting, presided over, if possible, by the Director in person, in order that business of both primary and secondary necessity may be gone through. The third Sunday of the month, to which a plenary indulgence is specially attached for the associates, would naturally be the day for a general communion and meeting. At the meeting, it would be necessary to have the distribution of the mysteries for the coming month. An easy way of managing the lottery would be to have the *Rosary tickets* of each circle placed in a heap on a tray, or in a box, then to have the names in each circle called over, and, as each associate's name is called, for him or her to come forward, take a ticket at random, and deposit at the same time whatever offering may be decided upon. If a member be absent, then the head of the circle can take the ticket, and charge himself to deliver it as soon as possible, and receive the offering.

Should the other system of distribution be adopted, it

¹ I would suggest the following:—"The Living Rosary is an association for encouraging the devotion of the Most Sacred Rosary. The associates are ruled by a Director (always a priest), and divided into circles of fifteen, every member of which says daily one mystery of the Rosary, so that between the fifteen members the whole Rosary is recited every day. The Director always has the power of appointing Zelators or Heads of Circles for carrying out the work of the sodality, and also, if he sees fit, a President or Presidents to preside over the Heads of Circles."

would be well to be warned against a danger noticed by Father Esser, O.P. (*Der Rosenkranz*. Paderborn, 1889, page 516):—

“This plan [he says] would frequently be chosen in preference to the other on account of its convenience. But even in this convenience there lies a danger; namely, if the members are not each month reminded of their mysteries, it might easily happen that in a short time a division would get into disorder, from the fault of several reciting the same mystery, while other mysteries would not be recited at all. In no case ought the Zelators consider themselves exempt from their duty of reminding the members of their mysteries at the change of them.”

Perhaps it would be well to call over the names in the order of mysteries, the Heads of Circles taking care to make the requisite change each month. Thus:—Circle of St. Patrick—Joyful Mysteries; 1st, John Dooley; 2nd, Peter M'Grath; 3rd, James Dowling; and so on. The next month each name would have been moved on a place, and the list would read:—1st, Thomas Purcell; 2nd, John Dooley; 3rd, Peter M'Grath, &c.

This essential business having been gone through, an opportunity will now be given to the Director to make any announcements he may judge necessary. The plenary indulgences, especially, that may be gained by the associates during the ensuing month should be announced.¹ The efficacy, then, of a practical discourse on one of the mysteries of the Rosary cannot be easily overrated. Confraternities and other religious associations among the people cannot be kept flourishing unless a healthy stimulus is supplied to them by contact with a zealous, if possible enthusiastic, Director; and the easiest way certainly for him to communicate his religious enthusiasm is by means of an address.

Along with the ends of the sodality already spoken of, it is quite permissible to unite some other object, always saving the legislation of decree No. 19. To quote Father Esser again:—

“Provided that the rules laid down for the Living Rosary be

¹ Here I should wish to point out that in the sodality cards hitherto issued by Gill of O'Connell-street, the list of indulgences is very far indeed from complete.

considered as the foundation, it is not forbidden to unite another purpose with that of the sodality. From its very foundation in Lyons it had the secondary object of spreading good books. In Germany we know a place where the associates have taken charge of decorating the parish church, and they take the opportunity of the monthly change of the Rosary tickets to contribute a small alms thereto." (*Der Rosenkranz*, page 511.)

Everything, then, in connection with such an extraneous object would be very well discussed and arranged at the monthly meeting of the Living Rosary Sodality. It must be borne in mind, however, that, useful and advantageous as such a meeting would be, it is not strictly necessary; and according to decree No. 17, it would be sufficient for a Zelator or Zelatrix to hold the monthly lottery along with two companions, and send the mysteries marked out by lot to the absent associates; or, in fine, to adopt the method permitted by decree No. 18; that, namely, "according to which the mysteries once assigned by lot, are, from that out, changed privately at the beginning of each month by the several Rosarians, according to the natural series of the mysteries."

T. M. BYRNE, O.P.

Theological Questions.

A MARRIAGE QUESTION.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—I had hopes that somebody would have called attention to the solution of the marriage question, which was proposed in the January number of the I. E. RECORD, with a view of eliciting more ample, and, if possible, more definite information on a subject of very great practical importance. For my part, I must confess, when I read over the case proposed by 'Sacerdos,' I made up my mind that the marriage which had been contracted between John — and Mary — was either an invalid marriage, or, at all events, a doubtfully valid one; and that being such, it should have been dealt with according to the

special well-known principles of ecclesiastical jurisprudence applicable in such cases. But let us come to the question at issue. 'John —— and Mary —— went to service in St. Peter's parish, and there acquired a quasi-domicile. They are both over twenty-one years of age, and make arrangements to get married, taking a house to live in after their marriage in the same parish (St. Peter's). Their parents live in St. John's parish, where they go and get married without the permission of the parish priest of St. Peter's, or his ordinary. Is the marriage valid,' &c. All will, I think, admit that if they got married in presence of the parish priest of St. Peter's, or of his delegate, their marriage would most certainly be a valid one. They had acquired a quasi-domicile in his parish—a fact sufficient of itself to enable them to contract marriage validly in his parish, and in his or his delegate's presence. But, more than this, without forfeiting the privilege thus acquired by reason of their quasi-domicile, they take a house in the same parish (St. Peter's): they intend to make that house their permanent place of residence: they intend to dwell in that parish as inhabitants and parishioners. In one word, they do everything, it would seem, that is necessary to acquire a true domicile in that parish. 'Verum domicilium [says Konings, N. 1614] voluntate propria acquiritur per duo simul conjuncta, per factum scilicet commorationis et animum semper manendi.' And Schmalz still more clearly points out what is necessary to constitute a domicile in any place: 'Ut quis domicilium in aliquo loco habeat duo requiruntur, animus et factum . . . utrumque requiritur copulative. Porro animus volentis constituere domicilium in aliquo loco debet esse quod velit in eo loco constituere habitationem perpetuam ac stabilem . . . quod intellige, nisi quid avocet: sufficit enim perpetuitas proposita, quamvis deinde propositum mutari, et domicilium alio transferri possit. Ad domicilium acquirendum opus non est ut Caius illuc bona sua, aut majorem aut ullam eorum partem transferat,' &c. Schmalzgrueber. (L. 2, tom. 2, N. 9, 10.)

"Now, it seems to me that the two conditions here laid down as necessary and sufficient to acquire a domicile have been most fully verified in the question proposed. John —— and Mary —— actually reside in St. Peter's parish—they fulfil condition (a) *factum commorationis*; they also place condition (b), for, by taking a house in which they purpose to reside, they manifest the '*animus constituendi in eo loco habitationem*

perpetuam, nisi quid avocet,' or the 'perpetuitas proposita.' It may be, indeed, that they will never reside in the house they have taken; it may be that the marriage, for some reason or other, will never be celebrated, and that the 'nisi quid avocet' will be verified in their case; still, I imagine, they will not cease to be parishioners of St. Peter's until they have left the parish, and relinquished the intention of residing in it as inhabitants of the place:—'Omnis enim res, per quascumque causas nascitur, per easdem dissolvitur.' (L. 5 Dec., Tit. 41, Reg. 1^a.) I do not, therefore, see the relevancy of saying, 'their intention was only conditional, and, therefore, insufficient for acquiring a domicile prior to the celebration of the marriage. We contend that the intention of dwelling in their new house, and of continuing to reside in St. Peter's parish was dependent on their marriage; and that if the marriage were frustrated, they would not inhabit the newly-purchased house, nor, perhaps, again revisit the parish.' Pope Benedict XIV. quotes, *a propos* of this point, a decree of the S. Rota—a tribunal of the very highest authority on matrimonial questions:—'Si parochialitas ad effectum validitatis matrimonii contrahitur ex habitatione, et animo permanendi per aliquod justum temporis intervallum, non est sane inquirendum ex qua causa vel in cujus domo habitaverit quis; sed satis est quod ibidem de facto habitaverit cum animo permanendi,' &c. Theologians, too, as far as I am aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions on this point; or about the cause determining such intentions. Sufficient for them that the conditions above mentioned exist. They then apply the good old principle, 'ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.'

"But, it has been argued: 'Even supposing that they had acquired a domicile in St. Peter's, it does not follow that they had lost their parental domicile. A person may have two domiciles. . . . Hence their marriage would be valid, even if they had acquired a domicile in St. Peter's parish.'

"Doubtless a person might have two domiciles—such cases are contemplated by theologians—but I doubt very much that John and Mary, in the case under discussion, fulfilled the conditions necessary for holding two domiciles. 'Possunt [says Feije, page 144, N. 229, 4^a] duo etiam haberi domicilia, aequaliter vel fere aequaliter habitando per modum veri domicilii sub duabus parochiis, ex gr. hyeme in civitate, aestate ruri; non autem requiritur

mathematica aequalitas, sed moralis sufficit.' And Pope Ben. XIV. still more explicitly says, *Instit.* 33, n. 36: 'Tunc solum duobus domiciliis instructum aliquem Jure appellari, cum in utraque aequaliter collocatus prudentium virorum judicio existimetur: quod etiam Juris Pontificii auctoritate probatur.' That John and Mary did not fulfil these conditions, and had no intention of fulfilling them, does not, I think, require proof.

"But when, it may be asked, did they lose their parental domicile? It may be that they lost it when they first left their homes to earn their bread. It would be an error to suppose that all servants retain a true canonical domicile in the home of their parents. The question as to whether John and Mary lost it when they first left their houses is a question of fact, which could only be decided by asking themselves what their intentions were at that time. 'Difficultates [says Dr. Murray, *De Imped. Mat.*, page 154] ex quæstionibus facti (v. g. utrum Caius miles, Titia famula, alibi domicilium habeat) non ad theologiam solvendæ pertinent sed, in singulis casibus occurrentibus, ad industriam et prudentiam parochi.' If, when leaving home, they had intended never more to live there as 'incolæ illius loci,' they would have lost their domicile in it, and the fact of their returning to celebrate a marriage, unforeseen at the time of their departure, would not restore it to them. It may not be out of place here to remark that Zitelli—an official of the Congregation of Propaganda—in his very useful *Apparatus Juris Ecclesiasti*, speaking of the domiciles of various classes of persons, says of servants: 'Famulis domicilium est in paroecia in qua famulantur.'

"But whatever opinion we may be inclined to form on this point, to me it seems pretty evident that the taking of the house in St. Peter's parish was a formal renunciation of their parental domicile; and consequently, from that moment they could not be considered to have anything more than a mere 'domicilium originis' in St. John's, which would not suffice for the validity of their marriage celebrated in it. For these and other reasons which might be assigned, I am of opinion that the marriage was, at least, doubtful as to its validity, and that it should be treated as such.—Faithfully yours,

"ALTER SACERDOS."

In the January number of the I. E. RECORD the following case was submitted to us by a respected correspondent. "John and Mary went to service in St. Peter's parish, and there acquired a quasi-domicile. They are both over twenty-

one years of age, and make arrangements to get married, taking a house to live in after their marriage in the same parish. Their parents live in St. John's parish, where they go and get married without the permission of the parish priest of St. Peter's, or his Ordinary. Is the marriage valid?" &c. In our reply we argued that the marriage is valid: and we supported our answer by the following two arguments:—(a) even if John and Mary had acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's, there was nothing to show that they had forfeited their parental *domicile* prior to their marriage; and (b) we denied that John and Mary had acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's prior to their marriage. Our present correspondent challenges both our arguments, and pronounces the marriage invalid, or, at least, only doubtfully valid. In replying we shall follow our correspondent's order, and inquire—(1) had John and Mary acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's prior to their marriage? and (2) had they before the marriage lost their parental *domicile*?

I.

Had John and Mary acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's prior to their marriage?

1. A person might argue—we wrote in the January number—that they had acquired a *domicile*; because they certainly had had a quasi-domicile; they had had a residence in the home of their employer; and now having purchased a new house, and being about to reside in the parish permanently in future, the quasi-domiciliary intention of residing *per majorem anni partem* is changed into an intention of permanent residence; therefore a person might argue that they had acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's. Nevertheless, we taught that John and Mary had not acquired a *domicile* in St. Peter's; "that their intention (of permanent residence) was only conditional, and therefore insufficient for acquiring a *domicile* prior to the celebration of the marriage."

2. Our correspondent, as we have observed, challenges this argument; and in support of his own view quotes a number of distinguished authorities on the conditions necessary for establishing a *domicile*. We have no objection

to their definitions; we cheerfully subscribe to their teaching. But our correspondent has made no serious attempt to reply to our argument; no attempt to show that a *conditional* intention of permanent residence is sufficient to *originate* a domicile. He does, indeed, reply to it in the following negative manner:—

“Theologians, too, as far as I am aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions on this point; or about the causes determining such intentions. Sufficient for them that the conditions above mentioned exist. They then apply the good old principle, ‘*Ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.*’”

We contend, however, that theologians do trouble themselves about the question of absolute and conditional intentions. They do not, perhaps, treat of them formally and explicitly; but, surely, it will suffice if we show that implicitly they insist on the principle of an absolute intention. Let us test their teaching by a few examples.

3. *Case A.*—A person from the country comes to Dublin—let us say, to prosecute a lawsuit. He engages fixed lodgings. He does not know on what day the case will be called, or how long it will last; but believes it may detain him in town for seven months. He intends to remain to the end of the case, and to return home immediately after its termination. Does this man acquire a quasi-domicile in Dublin? We can fancy our correspondent arguing:—(a) This man fulfils the first condition for quasi-domicile—*factum habitationis*; (b) he has *some kind* of intention of residing there *per majorem anni partem*; and (c) “the theologians, too, so far as I am aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions;” therefore (d) he has acquired a quasi-domicile in Dublin. The theologians, however, on the contrary, would say that this man has not a quasi-domicile in Dublin. Ballerini, for example, writes:—

“Quando deest animus figendi alicubi domicilium aut quasi-domicilium, nihil refert brevisne an longa ibi mora trahatur; ita v.g. si peregrinus in quapiam consistas urbe opperiens . . . litis alicujus exitum . . . quae reditum in patriam retardat . . . Etsi enim etiam quinquennio immo vel decennio moram in dies precariam ibi trahens perman eas, nunquam illud domicilii

jus acquirit, quod ad matrimonium coram parochia, quasi tuo valide contrahendum sufficit.”—(Gury-Ballerini, pars. ii., n. 847, note a.)

Ballerini does not, indeed, use the words *absolute* and *conditional* intention; but if we penetrate a little under the surface we shall see that he recognises the *principle* that conditional intention is of no avail, and that an absolute intention of residence is indispensably necessary to *originate* a domicile or quasi-domicile. For in the example he gives, and in our example, the person commences to reside in a parish; he intends to reside there as long as his business requires, but no longer; he *intends* to reside there *ad majorem anni partem*, or for several years, *if necessary*, for his business; and yet he does not acquire a domicile or quasi-domicile. And why does he not? Because the only *intention* recognised by the theologians is an absolute intention; and where only a conditional intention of residence exists, it can be said in the language of Ballerini, “Deest animus figendi alicubi domicilium aut quasi-domicilium.” This manifestly is the meaning of the theologians quoted by our correspondent; nor can we with any propriety of language say, without some qualifying clause, that a person has the intention of permanently residing in a place, if his intention *from the beginning* is known to be subject to certain conditions, and if he might cease at any moment to reside in the place on account of the non-fulfilment of these conditions.

4. *Case B.*—We endeavoured on some previous occasions to determine the conditions in which a domicile or quasi-domicile *ceases*, by appealing to the conditions necessary for its *inception*, because “Quibus mediis domicilium vel quasi-domicilium contrahitur, iisdem etiam solvitur.” We shall now reverse the process, and show that as a conditional intention of *abandoning* a domicile or quasi-domicile already established is not sufficient to *destroy* the domicile or quasi-domicile, so neither is it sufficient to *originate* it. Ladies from the provinces not unfrequently come to Dublin to be married. The parish priest or curate of their native parish assists at their marriage. They then go on their wedding tour, and afterwards repair directly to the homes of their

husbands, and continue to reside there. Now let us analyze this case in reference to the *cessation* of the parental domicile—
 (a) On leaving home to be married, the *factum habitationis* ceases; (b) they have some kind of intention of not returning to reside in their parental home; they are anxious to get married, and go to reside with their husbands. Can they, therefore, be married in Dublin by the parish priest of their native parish? Did not their domicile cease when they left their native home? We can imagine our correspondent answering that the domicile ceased on their departure from home, because the *factum habitationis* ceased, and there was some intention of not returning; and “theologians, as far as he is aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions.” Nevertheless, universal practice is opposed to such a view, and with good reason; for these ladies have only a conditional intention of leaving their parental homes, an intention dependent on the success of their wish or *velleitas* to secure a new home. And a conditional wish, as we have already remarked, cannot without some qualification or limitation be described “*voluntas . . non habitandi de cetero.*” Now “*quibus mediis domicilium contrahitur eisdem etiam solvitur;*” and hence, as a conditional intention of ceasing to reside in a parish will not destroy a domicile already established, so neither will a conditional intention of future residence suffice to establish a new domicile.

5. Our correspondent seems to have been misled by the words, “*Nisi quid avocet.*” A person shall have the intention of residing permanently in a place, “*nisi quid avocet.*” Now, the words “*nisi quid avocet*” do not sanction *conditional* intention; they are not opposed to *absolute* intention, but to *irrevocable* and *efficacious* permanent residence. A person, for example, to establish a quasi-domicile shall have the intention of residing *per majorem anni partem* in a parish. This intention must not depend on any *particular* condition known to him at the time. It must be an *absolute* intention. However, it need not be *irrevocable* nor *efficacious*, infallibly securing actual residence in the place for the greater part of

the year; the intention may be subsequently revoked on account of some supervening cause, or it may be rendered inefficacious through the intervention of some particular or general cause, *e.g.*, death. Hence the words “*nisi quid avocet*” do not mean that conditional intention is sufficient to originate a quasi-domicile; but that a quasi-domicile is established when the two conditions—*factum* and *animus*—are fulfilled, even though some unforeseen particular cause, or some general cause should compel the revocation of the intention, or render it partially inefficacious afterwards. (See example, Gury-Ballerini, page ii., n. 847, note *a*.)

6. Finally, in treating of the quasi-domicile of servants and certain other classes of persons, Dr. Murray has the following:—

“*Si alibi domicilium habeant, tunc aut intendunt locum ubi nunc sunt deserere . . . aut intendunt in loco ubi nunc sunt per majorem anni partem habitare, moralem habentes certitudinem se ex eo ante id tempus completum non esse amovendos. . . . In casu secundo contrahere possunt coram parochio aut domicilii aut loci ubi nunc sunt, utpote hic quasi-domicilium habentes.*” (n. 376, 2°.)

Now here Dr. Murray, though he does not introduce the words *absolute* and *conditional* intention, manifestly recognises the principle that an *absolute* intention of residence is necessary to originate a quasi-domicile; because the intention of residence which he requires must be accompanied by moral certainty that the person will continue to reside in the place for the greater part of a year; and how could a person have this moral certainty, if his intention of continuing to reside in the place were from the very beginning hampered with conditions which might necessitate his departure at any moment?

Our correspondent, too, quotes Zitelli. But how did the following passage escape his notice?—

“*Ad domicilium duo simul requiruntur, scilicet habitatio et animus semper manendi, qui animus, nisi aut verbis expressus sit aut actis quae illum significant, ex decennali habitatione praesumitur. Cum autem praesumptio veritati cedat, omnino cessat, si constet aliquem ob accidentalem causam aliculi habitare, qua deficiente discessurus est; quod si cessante tali*

conditione vel officio, quis ita habitare perseveret, ut, ex circumstantiis erui debeat animus perpetuo manendi, domicilium contractum censebitur." (Page 421, N. 3.)

Does not Zitelli here recognise the principle that conditional intention is insufficient to originate a domicile ; and that it is only when the condition ceases a person can begin to have the "animus perpetuo manendi" ?

7. We have now, we hope, abundantly proved than an *absolute intention* of permanently residing in a place is necessary to originate a domicile. And when our correspondent writes: "I do not, therefore, see the relevancy of saying 'their intention was only conditional, and therefore insufficient for acquiring a domicile prior to the celebration of the marriage,'" &c, he shows himself rather unacquainted with the subject on which he undertook to write. We might stop here. John and Mary had not an absolute intention of residing in St. Peter's prior to their marriage. They, therefore, had not a domicile there. And there is absolutely no reason for supposing that they had forfeited their parental domicile. Therefore, they could be married, and were validly married, in their native parish of St. John's.

8. But let us examine more closely the position of John and Mary on their wedding morning in reference to the parish of St. Peter. Whose was the newly-purchased house in St. Peter's? It was either John's, or Mary's, or both were joint owners. (a) If the house were John's, what was the position of Mary? She had left for ever the house of her employer in St. Peter's; in the interval between her departure from her employer and her marriage she had no home in the parish; and if the marriage were frustrated she might never again return to the parish, but remain at home, or seek employment somewhere else. How, then, could it be said that she had already a home in St. Peter's, and the intention of dwelling there for ever? On the contrary, a person might maintain that, during the interval which elapsed between her departure from her employer's and her marriage, she had not even a quasi-domicile in St. Peter's. Because she had no home in the parish; and having left her former home in the parish, and having no intention of

continuing a home in the parish during the interval, she might be said to have revoked the conditions of quasi-domicile—the *factum habitationis*, and the *animus*.

(b) If the house were Mary's, then it is manifest for similar reasons that John could not have acquired a domicile in St. Peter's prior to his marriage. And (c) if both were joint owners, the same difficulties would arise about the house and about the intention of future residence in St. Peter's. Because neither would go to live in the newly-purchased house if the marriage did not take place; and both together dare not go to live there prior to the celebration of their marriage. We conclude, therefore, that John and Mary had not acquired a domicile in St. Peter's prior to their marriage.

II.

Had John and Mary lost their *parental domicile* before their marriage?

We argued in the January number of this periodical that, even if John and Mary had acquired a domicile in St. Peter's prior to their marriage, it might be contended that they also retained their parental domicile, as according to the teaching of theologians a person can have two domiciles at the same time. Our correspondent challenges this argument also. But while he undoubtedly quotes some standard authorities in support of his views on this as well as on the preceding question, we cannot help suspecting that he did not allow himself sufficient time to digest and assimilate their teaching. As we have already shown that John and Mary had not acquired a domicile in St. Peter's prior to their marriage, we shall be brief in our treatment of this subject.

1. First, then, our correspondent writes: "In order to have two domiciles a person shall reside equally in both—about a half year in each. But this could not be said of John and Mary, because, in the hypothesis of their marriage, they had only a few days to spend in their native parish."

Ans. (a) We must remember that a person can *retain* two *acquired domiciles*, even if he spends years away from both.

(b) Our correspondent's doctrine is true of the *ori-*

gination of two domiciles, and it indicates, moreover, the normal way in which they are retained and continued. But

(c) It is not necessary for the *continuance* of two domiciles that at *each moment* a person shall be prepared to dwell in, or even retain, his two homes for equal terms of succeeding years. If some unforeseen cause should compel him to abandon one of his homes even on the next day, he will retain his domicile there, until, together with the revocation of the *animus manendi*, actual habitation also ceases. For example: a gentleman has a domicile in Dublin, and another in Kingstown; he lives in Dublin from January to July, and in Kingstown for the remainder of the year. In May, 1891, some unforeseen event compels him to arrange for his certain and absolute departure from the country in the following December. Now, what we ask, is this gentleman's position in reference to his Dublin domicile from May to July? Does he retain that domicile? Our correspondent should answer in the negative; because to have two domiciles a person shall reside a half year in each home; but after May this gentleman can never again reside six months in his Dublin home; he can stay there only until July. Therefore in May he loses his domicile there, though the *factum habitationis* will continue to July. How very absurd! Now the servants of whom we are writing retained their parental domicile with the *quasi-domicile* of their place of service. And even if this quasi-domicile had become a domicile, their parental domicile would not cease from the mere fact that they had still only a few days or a few hours residence in their parental homes.

2. "When," our correspondent asks, "did they lose their parental domicile? It may be that they lost it when they first left their homes to earn their bread It is only a question of fact which could only be decided by asking themselves what their intentions were at that time If when leaving home they had intended never more to live there as '*incolae illius loci*,' they would have lost their domicile in it," &c.

Ans. (a) Here again our correspondent seems to us to exaggerate the conditions required for a continuance of

domicile. He seems to suspect that servants not unfrequently lose their domicile when they leave home. He appears to think that the words "*ut incolae illius loci*" suppose an intention of returning home, and living continuously for some time at home. But we must remember that there is question of the *continuance* of domicile; and the conditions required for the continuance of domicile are better expressed in negative than in positive terms. It is surely sufficient if the intention of regarding the parental domicile as their home to which they might at any moment return to live—if the intention of again dwelling there does not *absolutely* cease, or is not *absolutely* revoked at the time of their departure. Of course it is possible that servants sometimes lose their parental domicile when going to service; but we think that such cases are the exceptions and not the rule; we think that without interruption they regard the parental home as their own home, to which they might again return, and in which they might dwell as *incolæ*, if circumstances so required; and we think that, in several circumstances, in various conditions of life, *e. g.*, in ill health, in the intervals between two periods of service, &c., this continuous union of servants with their parental home is abundantly and unmistakably manifested. Hence, when servants have had a domicile before they went to service, *per se*, we assume that it continues, unless there be some reason to the contrary.

(b) But "it may be that they lost their domicile when they left home." No doubt it *may* be; it is *possible*. But is there any reason for assuming or even suspecting that it *was* so? None whatever. The parish priest who referred the case to us, no doubt, employed all necessary prudence and industry to acquaint himself fully with the circumstances of the case. And yet it never occurred to him, as far as we could gather from his communication, to suspect that John and Mary lost their parental domicile when they "left home to earn their bread." His only difficulty was, that by purchasing a house in St. Peter's they may have acquired a *domicile* there, and in that way lost their parental domicile; but we have already shown

that they did not acquire a domicile in St. Peter's prior to their marriage; and that, therefore, our former correspondent need have no anxiety about the validity of the marriage.

3. With regard to the quotation from Zitelli, we think it must be regarded as an example of the loose and inaccurate forms of expression we sometimes meet even in our classical authors. The *domicile* of servants is in the parish of their service! We have been accustomed to read of the *quasi-domicile* of servants in the parish of their service. And are we henceforward to believe that a servant, *e.g.*, who intends to remain only one year in a parish has even a *domicile* in the parish?

4. "But, at least, the taking of the house in St. Peter's," our correspondent urges, "was a formal renunciation of their parental domicile." We have already shown in our reply to the first question that the taking of the house in St. Peter's in no way whatsoever affected the parental domicile prior to the marriage. If John and Mary went home and got married during their period of service, during their *quasi-domicile* in St. Peter's, no one would seriously question the validity of their marriage. And similarly there should be no doubt about the validity of their marriage, even after they had completed the period of their service. The purchase of the house in the circumstances did not indicate the renunciation of the parental domicile, but merely an intention of renouncing it soon; of renouncing it after their marriage. They went home in the usual way that servants go home; during their sojourn at home they were not strangers but *incolae*; if the marriage were frustrated, the parental homes would be their only homes during the interval of their disengagement from service; they may even remain at home permanently—at least it is as likely as that they would inhabit the newly-purchased house in St. Peter's, or again revisit the parish.

We conclude therefore, again, that there is no reason whatever for doubting the validity of the marriage of John and Mary celebrated in their native parish.

JURISDICTION OF RETIRED PRIESTS—QUASI-DOMICILE—
TEMPERANCE PLEDGE — EXCOMMUNICATION — PROMISE
OF MARRIAGE.

“VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly answer the following questions in the next number of the I. E. RECORD ?

“1. Whether a priest who has for a long time retired—say for years—through ill health or his own choice, and whose faculties have never been *actually* revoked, need have them now renewed in case of restoration to health, or of his being asked by any priest of the same diocese to help in hearing confessions. The usual practice of the bishop of the said diocese is to give *the faculties of the diocese* to priests entering on the mission there ; and in case of removal from one parish to another, to make no further mention of faculties, but merely to say you are transferred from such a mission to such another.

“2. Do you think one can have *two quasi-domiciles* ? It is beyond question, I believe, that one can have two *domiciles* ; and it strikes me as strange if one cannot have two *quasi-domiciles*, as well. Still, as authors (especially in I. E. RECORD) are divided as to what is necessary to constitute a quasi-domicile, the matter appears very doubtful. Some hold that *more than six months* is necessary for a *quasi-domicile*, while a *great many* others hold as *certain* that *six months* are quite sufficient for it.

“One would imagine, to take a common-sense view of the matter, that since *factum* and *animus*, &c., are all that is required for the domicile, that the case ought to be *a pari* with regard to the *quasi-domicile*. *Quasi* means *like* ; i.e., one ought to be able to establish *two temporary homes* by a process similar to that by which he establishes *two permanent homes*. I know the late declaration of the Congregation is against this view, but perhaps it might fairly be interpreted in a moral sense ; i.e., in round numbers, for six months.

“If such is not the case, it does away with the generally received opinion, that servants hiring for *six months* acquire a *quasi-domicile*.

“3. In the case of persons having taken a temperance pledge, has any priest power to free them from that pledge on any particular occasion ? Can he say to them : ‘ I’ll give you leave to take something on this event ? ’ And, even if he had any such power, do you think it at all prudent to use it so ?

“I am aware, and the parties themselves are likely aware,

that the pledge binds under no sin, but still have had no notion beforehand of any such power in the priest.

"4. The censure of excommunication against those who attempt marriage *knowing they are under a diriment impediment*, is, I assume, removed since the time of Pius IX., not being again included in his '*Constitution Ap. sedis.*' If such still appeared in the statutes of any diocese, through inadvertence or otherwise of the ordinary (copied, no doubt, formerly from the general laws and censures of the Church), would it have still a binding force? Or is it *now ultra vires* for a bishop to insist on such a censure in this country, where, I take it, there can be no "*special reason*" for its enforcement more than in any other portion of the Church?

"5. If a man, on the day immediately before his marriage (*omnibus paratis*) comes and confesses he is bound by a *valid* promise to another girl, what is it prudent for the confessor to do? *I take for granted that the girl with whom he has broken his promise knows all about his marriage, and did so for days before, and made no remonstrance to priests about his having broken promise with her.* At the same time it is almost certain if the confessor tells him he is bound to his promise and should marry the former girl, he will not be obeyed. Is the confessor, then, to declare to him that he is bound to marry the girl he has promised, or is it the wise and prudent course under the circumstances to remain silent?—Yours faithfully,

"A SUBSCRIBER."

I.

JURISDICTION OF RETIRED PRIESTS.

Priests may retire from the mission in various ways, and in widely different circumstances; and hence it would be difficult to give a satisfactory answer to our correspondent's question without separating the many cases that are grouped under this general heading. Lehmkuhl states the general doctrine on the subject, as far as it regards secular priests, in these words: "*Si autem jurisdictio et approbatio simul collata erat propter munus, quod confessarius tanquam subditus in aliqua dioecesi gessit, non censetur abdicato munere perdurare. Quare sacerdos sæcularis, qui munus capellani aliudve gessit, si in alteram dioecesim translatus est, in priori dioecesi non censetur facultatem excipiendi confessiones retinere, nisi*

aliunde de contraria mente Episcopi constet." (P. ii., L. 1, Tr. v., N. 382, note 1.) Hence :—

(a) Parish priests who retire from the mission in this sense, that they resign the administration of their parish to an administrator but remain parish priests, retain together with their office whatever jurisdiction they previously may have had in the diocese. But if they absolutely resign their parish, then we must apply to them the same principles which we apply to curates.

(b) Priests who, with the consent of their bishop, temporarily resign their mission, and go to serve him in a different diocese still retain their jurisdiction, though they may accept a temporary appointment from another bishop, and in another diocese. For example, this happens in the case of priests who are deputed to collect for churches or other charities in distant countries. They would not be said to have absolutely abdicated their office or appointment in their native diocese.

(c) We would say the same of persons, whether parish priests or curates, who retire through ill health, but still remain associated with the working body of clergy by receiving a pension from a parish or an allowance from a retired priests' fund. This would be particularly true of a person who retired through ill health while still comparatively young, and who expected to be able to resume his duties in improved health at a later period. Of course we always suppose the faculties not to have been actually revoked.

(d) On the other hand, we think that a person who formally or virtually abdicates his union with the priests of the diocese loses his jurisdiction. Hence we think: first, that a secular priest who receives an *exeat* loses his jurisdiction, even before he is adopted into another diocese; secondly, that a priest who retires even from his own choice, and lives completely isolated from the clergy, devoting himself to secular pursuits, and living on his private means, immediately loses his jurisdiction.

In reply, therefore, to our correspondent, we would take the word *minus* of Lehmkuhl in a wide sense; and say that a priest who has retired from the mission, and whose faculties

have not been expressly revoked, retains his faculties as long as he is morally united with the working clergy of the diocese; and that he loses his faculties when he severs this moral union, and lives a quasi-secular life in the world.

II.

QUASI-DOMICILE.

We think our correspondent means to ask, can a person have *two* quasi-domiciles *successively* within the *same year*. Because his argument seems to be: "A person may have two domiciles: the same ought be true of *quasi*-domicile: one ought to be able to establish two permanent homes in a year, because the *major pars anni* may be fairly interpreted in round numbers for six months." We will extend the scope of our correspondent's question, and ask—

(a) Can a person have two quasi-domiciles *simultaneously*?

(b) Can a person have two quasi-domiciles *successively*?

(c) Can he have them within the same year?

(a) Can a person have two quasi-domiciles *simultaneously*? Theologians do not speak of the multiplication of quasi-domiciles as they do of domiciles. Yet we think a person can have two quasi-domiciles *simultaneously*. For example, a person has commenced actual residence in a parish, and intends to reside there for three years, and only three years. This is a quasi-domicile. Later on the person is obliged—while retaining his former home—to reside for the greater part of one of the years in another parish. This man would certainly have two quasi-domiciles *simultaneously*.

(b) Of course a person can have two quasi-domiciles *successively*.

(c) Can a person have two quasi-domiciles *successively within the same year*? This is equivalent to asking, are the words, "*per majorem anni partem*," mentioned in the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation, dated 7th July, 1867, to be understood strictly of the *greater* part of a year; or are they to be interpreted morally so as to mean *half a year*? Prior to the issuing of this Instruction of the Sacred Congregation,

there were three principal opinions of theologians as to the time required to constitute a quasi-domicile.

1. Some theologians taught that it is sufficient if the time morally approach to a half-year. "Alii vero," writes Lehmkuhl, "dicunt sufficere, ut tempus illud lato quodam sensu ad dimidium annum accedat, seu ut notabiliter tres menses excedat." (P. ii., L. i., Tr. viii., n. 775.)

2. Others, again, held that *half a-year exactly* is sufficient, as Sporer and Mazzotta. (Murray, n. 371.)

3. Finally, the common opinion of theologians taught, that to establish a quasi-domicile a person shall have the intention of residing in a place *per maiorem anni partem*. (Murray, *ibid.*) And the Sacred Congregation has adopted the language of these theologians in the Instruction to which we have already referred: "Ad constituendum quasi-domicilium . . . duo simul requiruntur: habitatio nempe . . . atque animus ibidem permanendi *per maiorem anni partem*." These are the *data* we have for forming a judgment on the question proposed by our correspondent. Possibly, different persons will draw different conclusions from these *data*. We, however—although some modern theologians¹ who have seen this Instruction, seem to recognise a half-year as still sufficient—adopt the teaching of Dr. Murray (nn. 371, 372), and we think that the words of the Instruction should be understood literally of the *greater* part of a year. We adopt this opinion—first, because the Sacred Congregation in adopting the terminology of the theologians, who required the *major pars anni*, must, we think, be supposed to have adopted their teaching also; and second, because if we introduce any laxity of interpretation in reference to the Instruction, we shall be thrown back again into the confusion of opinions that preceded its publication. For example, if we take it to mean a half-year exactly, another may say it should be interpreted morally, so as to mean five months and a-half, or five months; and so we should frustrate the end of the publication of this Instruction.

¹ Konings writes: "Si agitur de quasi-domicilio, ex Resp. S. C. Inq. ad postul. Syn. Pl. Manut. certa est sententia, quæ exigit habitationem per maiorem adeoque per integram saltem dimidiam anni partem." (Vol. ii., n. 1614, Q. 1, Resp. 1.) Feije, too, expresses himself in a similar way, nn. 210, 227.

III.

TEMPERANCE PLEDGE.

As our correspondent supposes that the pledge does not bind under sin, we must regard it as only a very solemn species of resolution. And as priests have no indiscriminate power of telling their people to break their good resolutions generally, so neither have they in the matter of the pledge; it is neither prudent nor permissible for them to free their people from a pledge, unless there is a sufficient cause. Then, if there be a sufficient cause, manifestly any priest may tell a pledged person that he is excused from his pledge; unless, indeed, the rules of his association require a person to get permission from the president of the association, or from some other particular person.

IV.

THE CENSURE OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

1. We think that it is not *ultra vires* for a bishop to continue the censure. It would be *ultra vires* for a bishop, to extend the scope of a general law of the Church, and to require of his subjects more than the law requires of the faithful generally. Hence, in treating of the third precept of the Decalogue, St. Liguori writes: "Episcopus non potest censuris . . . cogere ad audiendam Missam in parochia . . . Ratio autem est quia, ut ait Navarr., episcopus non potest tollere (nec restringere) jus commune, et generalem totius orbis consuetudinem." (Lib. iii., Tr. iii., cap i., Dub. iv., n. 322.) But it is not *ultra vires* to enforce existing general laws by enacting local censures. Possibly it may be urged that the abrogation of the general law of the Church is an indication that the adequate and complete purpose of the law for the whole community has ceased, and that the law itself therefore has similarly ceased. If the total end of the law had ceased for the whole community, then indeed the law would cease; it would be no longer useful. But we might say that the abrogation of the general censure only proves that it is no longer *necessary* for the whole Church; but does not prove that it may not be sometimes *useful* for the whole, or at

least some parts of the Church. Then no very particular reason for the censure is required. There is no question of the *infliction* of a censure, but of the enactment of a penal law, for which it is sufficient, if, like all laws, it conduce to the public good, if of its own nature it be apt to secure the better observance of the laws relating to the impediments of matrimony. If, therefore, a bishop wished to continue the law, we would not question his power to do so.

2. But as to the question of fact; of course if it still appears in some diocesan statutes, it depends on the will of the bishops whether it still binds or not. But we should think that, until the bishop abrogates the statute, it remains in full force. This law was not merely copied into the statutes, but, in addition to the common law of the Church, the bishop made a diocesan law in the same matter. Hence the law will cease only by an express or implied act of the bishop, or by contrary custom.

3. We have, so far, discussed this question, on the assumption of our correspondent, that this law was "copied, no doubt, formerly from the general laws and censures of the Church." We have not had much time to examine the general censures that have fallen into disuse. But we find that the excommunication referred to by our correspondent was not contained in the *Bulla Cænæ*. Neither is it contained in the Tridentine laws. And we are inclined, therefore, to believe that wherever the censure appeared in diocesan statutes, it was purely a diocesan excommunication; and has not been intertered with by the Bull *Apostolicæ Sedis*.

V.

PROMISE OF MARRIAGE.

The question seems to us to suppose only a simple promise, or at most *private* and somewhat occult sponsalia. And we think, as our correspondent himself seems to imply, that, as no great harm seems to have been done to the first *sponsa* (otherwise she would remonstrate against the marriage of the *sponsus* with another), and as there is no reasonable hope that the priest's admonition would be attended to, the person may be left in his *bona fides*.

HONORARIA FOR SECOND MASS.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—For a long time—at least for some time--the priests of this diocese have enjoyed the privilege of taking a *honorarium* for their *second* mass on Sundays and holidays. Recently, however, our bishop has withdrawn it; not, indeed, arbitrarily, but on the ground that he himself only held the power of granting it *ad quinquennium*, and that this has lapsed.

“Now, may I venture to disregard this prohibition; and, if I do, how far would I commit sin if I based my non-compliance on the following arguments?—

“1. There has been a *consuetudo* on the point, at least in this diocese.

“2. The *reason*, I take it, of this prohibitory law was to guard against the possibility of *avarice* by saying a second mass *in order to get a second honorarium*; but in our case the very reverse holds true; we—of course, I am speaking of curates—are bound *volentes volentes* to say a second mass; and hence, I hold that this law does not apply to us.

“3. What about the case of a priest who often has no *honoraria* on some other days, nor even for his *first* mass on Sunday, though he may, perchance, be offered one for his *second* mass? for, to be strictly literal, the law applies to this latter case.

“4. How far do the Maynooth Statutes, page 81, No. 68, bear out our bishop?—Yours in Christ,

“C. C.”

We think that our correspondent can no longer avail himself of the privilege of taking two *honoraria* on Sundays and holidays. The reason is: he was enabled to take a *honorarium* for his second mass on Sundays and holidays, only in virtue of the permission received from his bishop; but his bishop's permission has ceased, “as he himself only held the power of granting it *ad quinquennium*, which has now lapsed.” Our correspondent, we are sure, is of the same opinion; but he pleads the cause of the opposite opinion, in order that the question may be discussed, and all doubt about it removed. He argues, therefore:—

“1. That there has been a *custom* of taking two *honoraria* in his diocese. And, therefore, it is lawful for the priests to continue receiving two *honoraria*, though the bishop's power of dispensing in the matter has ceased.”

I would answer, *nego antecedens*. Of course, we speak of a custom *contra legem*. Now, a custom *contra legem* is the continued repetition of acts or omissions against a law. But in the present case the law had been removed by dispensation for the priests of our correspondent's diocese, before they commenced to take two *honoraria* for their masses on festivals. They were not therefore acting against the law. Dispensation, therefore, so far from introducing a custom against a law, is rather a strong testimony to the reality and vitality of the law. For example, we have been receiving dispensations for years from a portion of the Lenten abstinence; but yet there is no custom against that portion of the Lenten law; and if the usual dispensation were refused during the present Lent, we should be back again to the more austere rigour of the early ages of the Church. Our correspondent, therefore, cannot plead *custom* for continuing to receive two *honoraria* on Sundays and holidays.

2. Our correspondent next urges the theological maxim, "Finis legis est anima ejus." "The reason of this prohibitory law was to guard against the possibility of *avarice* by saying a second mass *in order to get a second honorarium*. The reason ceases in the present case. Therefore the law too ceases."

I answer, *distinguo majorem*: the *total* and *adequate* reason of the law was to guard against *avarice*, &c., *nego*. A *partial* reason of the law was to guard against *avarice*, &c., *concedo*. Now, to come to the minor proposition: "The the reason of law ceases in the present case." *Contradist. min.* The *total* and *adequate* cause; *nego*. A *partial* cause; *concedo*.

In laws that are enacted to guard against the danger of abuses, theologians distinguish two motives—a direct and an indirect motive. In the present case the direct motive is the prevention of *avarice*. This motive does not exist in every case, because in very many cases there is no danger of *avarice*. What, then, is the reason of the law in these cases? The reason of the law in these cases—the indirect motive—is to secure uniformity and to prevent the law from becoming

quite inoperative. For if it were permitted to each person to interpret the law for himself, and to determine whether the reason of the law existed in his own case or not, we should be soon back again to the abuses which called forth this same Church legislation. This is confirmed by the fact that, when the Church permits bination, even when two masses must be said, she always prohibits her priests to take two *honoraria*. And a case is recorded where the Holy See, consulting for the extreme poverty of a parish priest, who had applied for permission to receive a *honorarium* for his second mass after offering the first *pro populo*, allowed him to offer the mass *pro populo* on a week morning, and to accept one *honorarium* on Sunday. This parish priest was bound *volens volens* to say two masses on Sundays and holidays; and yet the Holy See, while willing to alleviate his manifest poverty, would not allow him to offer his first mass *pro populo* and accept a *honorarium* for the second. On the contrary, it consulted for the pastor's needs, and marked in a most emphatic way its sense of the importance of this law against two *honoraria*, by dispensing in another law, by allowing him to offer his mass *pro populo* on a week day, rather than permit him to discharge two obligations of justice on Sundays and holidays.

3. In reply to our correspondent's third point, we would lay down the same doctrine for priests who may not have *honoraria* on some other week days. What shall we say if a priest had no *honorarium* for his first mass, and was offered one for his second mass? Though, as our correspondent says, the decrees seem to prohibit a *honorarium* for the second mass absolutely, we think they pre-suppose a *honorarium* to have been received for the first mass, and only forbid a priest to receive two *honoraria* for his masses on the same day. We think they do not forbid one *honorarium*, whether it be received for the first or second mass. Thus Varceno writes: "Qui binas Missas celebrat non potest duplicatum stipendium accipere: . . . Neque secunda Missa, quando prima fuit applicata ad satisfaciendum onus ex justitia, poterit applicari pro satisfactione alterius oneris pariter ex justitia." (Tom. ii., cap. iv., art. i., p. 90.)

4. Finally, the paragraph in the Maynooth Statutes, to which our correspondent refers, proves what we have been endeavouring to establish. It states—(a) that when a bishop grants parish priests faculties to duplicate, he shall admonish them that from no person, and on no pretext, shall they accept a *honorarium* for the second mass; (b) that on account of the circumstance of some missionary countries the Holy Father has granted to their bishops, “*Ut justa et gravi causa intercedente sacerdotes sibi subditi hujusmodi stipendium possint ac valeant percipere.*” (c) It is stated that, “*Haec permissio ad Hiberniae praesules extenditur.*” Evidently, therefore, when a bishop’s power has expired, or if a bishop prefers not to exercise this power, his priests cannot accept two *honoraria* for the two masses they say on Sundays and holiday.

D. COGHLAN.

Liturgical Questions.

THE FIRST PRAYER IN A REQUIEM MASS.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—1. Would you kindly say if the Litany of the Blessed Virgin is indulgenced the same as that of the Holy Name, so that the faithful have the same benefit by the devout recital of each.

“2. In the *missa quotidiana*, in saying the prayer, ‘*Deus qui inter Apostolicos*,’ &c is the word ‘*seu*’ said as in the prayer; and in that prayer do we pray for bishops and priests, or is one order excluded?

“3. Is this prayer to be always said in the first place? I have lately been speaking to some priests about these points. They have different opinions. Please say a word about this matter in I. E. RECORD of next month.

“H. M. R.”

1. The indulgences attached to the recital of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, commonly called “the Litany of Loretto,” are practically the same as those attached to the

recital of the Litany of the Holy Name, but are, if anything, somewhat more extensive. The words of the *Raccolta* are as follow :—

“The Sovereign Pontiff, Pius VII., by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, Sept. 30, 1817, not only confirmed the indulgence of two hundred days granted by Sixtus V. and Benedict XIII., but extended it to *three hundred days* every time that, with at least contrite heart and devotion the Litany of the Blessed Virgin is said. He granted, moreover, to all who shall say it daily, a *plenary indulgence* on the five feasts of obligation of our Blessed Lady ; viz., the Immaculate Conception, Nativity, Annunciation, Purification, and Assumption ; on condition, that on each of these days, being truly penitent, they shall, after confession and communion, visit a public church and pray there for the intèntion of his Holiness.”¹

2. The prayer, *Deus qui inter Apostolicos sacerdotes*, &c., is to be said as it is in the missal, as has been again and again declared by the Congregation of Rites. Moreover, an edition of the missal having appeared, in which the particle *seu* was printed in italics, thereby implying that it was not to be considered as a part of the prayer, the Sacred Congregation decided that the missal should be corrected. From this it follows that *seu* is a part of the prayer, and is always to be said as such. This much having been premised, it is easy to infer, in reply to the concluding portion of our correspondent's second question, that in saying this prayer, we pray for both the superior and inferior orders of priests ; that is, for both bishops and priests.

3. The third question is not so easily answered as either of the preceding. If we follow modern writers on the Rubrics, we should answer unhesitatingly that the prayer, *Deus qui inter*, &c., should always be said in the first place in the *missa quotidiana* when celebrated as a private mass ; but if we consult the older writers, without taking into account either the authority or arguments of the moderns, we should just as unhesitatingly declare that the first prayer should be, not *Deus qui inter*, &c., but that one of the prayers given in the missal after the Requiem masses, which is appropriate to the intention for which the mass is offered. For example,

¹ English Translation, Philadelphia, 1889.

if a priest celebrates the *missa quotidiana* for a deceased priest, the first prayer, according to the older writers, should be the prayer *pro sacerdote*; if for a deceased person not a priest, the prayer *pro uno defuncto*, or *pro una defuncta*; and if for several deceased persons, the prayer *pro pluribus defunctis*. This opinion is held by all who have a claim to be regarded as the classic writers on Rubrics, among whom may be mentioned Merati, Guyetus, Lohner, Romsée, Jansens, Brassine, and De Herdt himself in the first four editions of his invaluable *Praxis Liturgiae*. In subsequent editions, however, De Herdt has changed, and now holds with the entire, or almost the entire, array of modern Rubricists.

But more important for us than the fact that a writer holds a certain view, or has changed his opinion, are the motives which convince him that his present opinion is correct. For with regard to modern Rubricists in particular, the value of their opinion depends not on their authority, but on the arguments by which it is supported. Now, if we act on this principle we must come to the conclusion that neither De Herdt, nor those who agree with him, had any reason sufficient to justify them in abandoning the teaching of the early writers. The following is the resolution of the Congregation of Rites to which it would appear De Herdt attributes his change of opinion; and as he quotes this one *in extenso* we may take it for granted that he considered it the most convincing:—

“An in missis quotidianis de *Requiem* sacerdos sive ratione eleemosynae sive legati private celebrans pro aliqua, aut pro aliquibus determinatis personis defunctis debetne indiscriminatim dicere primam orationem *Deus qui inter Apostolicos, &c.*, primo loco in missali assignatam; an potius loco dictae orationis tenetur aliam dicere ex diversis in eodem missali positis quae conveniat ei aut iis determinatis personis pro quibus missam applicet? S. eadem Congregatio proposito dubio rescribere rata est. *Affirmative ad primam partem. Negative ad secundam.*” (S. R. C. Sept. 16, 1865, n. 5355, in *Tuscanem*.)

Now what does the Congregation in this resolution affirm, and what does it deny? It affirms that a priest celebrating a private Requiem mass for one or more deceased persons should always, without exception (*indiscriminatim*)

say the prayer, *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, &c., which is placed first in the missal (*primo loco in missali assignatam*). It denies that a priest is ever bound (*tenetur*) to omit this prayer, and substitute for it one from the prayers given in the missal, appropriate to the person or persons for whom he celebrates. And what is the conclusion from this? Nothing more, certainly, than that the prayer *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, &c., must always be *one* of the three prayers said in a private Requiem mass, and that a priest is not bound in order to satisfy an obligation to say a prayer appropriate to the intention for which he celebrates. But there is not a word or phrase from which anyone could infer that this particular prayer should be said in the first place, or that a prayer specially adopted to the intention for which the mass is offered *may* not be said, or *should* not be said before it. We may conclude, therefore, that so far as the Rubrics and Resolutions of the Congregation of Rites are concerned, there is no evidence of any obligation or precept binding a priest to say the prayer *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, &c., as the first of three prayers in a private Requiem mass. The question then must be decided by the arguments and authority of those who support the opposite opinions. And with regard to authority, no one will for a moment think of comparing our modern Rubricists, able and learned though many of them undoubtedly are, with the older writers whose names have been given. Moreover, whereas the moderns rely for support of their opinion *solely* on the Resolutions of the Congregation of Rites, which as we have just seen afford them no support, the older writers give many solid reasons, chiefly from analogy, to prove that their opinion and it alone is in conformity with true liturgical principles.

The conclusion, then, at which we have arrived is—1, that a priest satisfies an obligation of celebrating a private Requiem mass for one or many by saying as the prayers the three given in the *missa quotidiana*, and in the order in which they are given; 2, that, though not of obligation, it is yet advisable that the first prayer should be that which best fits the intention for which the mass is offered. A writer

in the *Ephemerides Liturgicae*,¹ after a careful and able analysis of all the decrees of the Congregation of Rites bearing on this matter, arrives at conclusions practically the same as these; and the learned editor states in a note, that his Eminence Cardinal Parocchi defends these conclusions, and declares that he himself never had a doubt regarding them.

II. DOLOUR BEADS.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you be kind enough to answer the following questions in the next number of the I. E. RECORD?—

1. What form of blessing is used for blessing Dolour beads? 2. Is it necessary that the person for whom they are blessed be present? A form given in the Ritual would seem to suppose that he should. 3. Is there any difference between Dolour beads and the Crown beads?”

1. The *Formula* given in the Ritual for blessing Dolour beads must be employed by all priests, whether secular or regular, who have power to bless these beads, whether they have this power from the General of Servites, or directly from the Holy See.²

2. It is not necessary that the person for whom the beads are blessed, or who is afterwards to use them, should be present while the priest is blessing them. The Ritual is misleading, because the *Formula* there given assumes that the scapular of the Seven Dolours is blessed and conferred on the same occasion on which the beads are blessed. Manifestly, however, as the investiture in the scapular lasts for a lifetime, the power of blessing beads cannot be limited to the occasions on which the scapular must be conferred.

3. There is a very marked difference both in form and signification between the Dolour and the Crown beads. As regards signification, the Dolour beads are said in honour of the Seven Dolours of our Lady of Sorrows, while the Crown beads are intended to honour the Passion of our divine Lord. They differ also in form; for, whereas the Dolour beads are made up of seven *septades*, on each of which a *Hail Mary* is said, preceded by a large bead, on which is

¹ Vol i., page 207, *et sq.*

² *Decr. Anthem*, n. 401.

said an *Our Father*, the Crown are composed of three *decades*, and three single grains, on each of which an *Our Father* is said; the *decades*, moreover, are preceded by a large grain on which is said a *Hail Mary*, and both before and after the last three is also a large grain, on each of which likewise is said a *Hail Mary*.

III. HYMNS IN THE VERNACULAR DURING MASS.

“REV. DEAR SIR,—Might I ask you to give a reply to a simple query in the next number of the I. E. RECORD? What is to be said of the practice of singing hymns, &c., in English *during* the celebration of mass? Is it necessary that what is sung during the celebration of mass be in the Latin tongue? and, moreover, that the hymn, &c., be approved of by competent authority for use in the public service of the Church?

“SUBSCRIBER.”

Several decrees of the Congregation of Rites forbid the singing of hymns, &c., in the vernacular during mass, or any other strictly liturgical action. But, strange to say, rubricists, with the express approval of the same Congregation,¹ have excepted from this category private masses, and declare it to be lawful to sing during such masses pious hymns or prayers in the vernacular, *provided, however, they have the approval of the bishop*, which is always necessary when there is question of the public recital or singing of anything extra-liturgical. Moreover, both the rubricists and the Congregation have in mind congregational as distinguished from mere choral singing.²

D. O'LOAN.

¹ Dec. 2, 1858, in *Lucionem*, n. 3.

² Bourbon, *Introduction*, &c., n. 586, note (1).

Correspondence.

“THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN MACHALE, BY THE RIGHT
REV. BERNARD O'REILLY.”—A REJOINDER.

“VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—May I count upon your sense of justice and fair play to publish in the next issue of the *I. E. RECORD*, a few observations in reference to two episcopal letters which appeared in the March number of that periodical ?

“1. In these letters a statement, quoted from the second volume of the *Life and Times of John MacHale*, by the Right Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, is qualified as not merely slanderous and calumnious, but as basely and grossly so. That statement, however, thus qualified by your Most Rev. correspondents, is from the pen of the late Archbishop of Tuam himself, and forms part of a document written and sent by him to his ecclesiastical superiors in Rome, as anyone can see who turns to the page referred to. Had your correspondents been aware of this fact, one at least of them, if not both, would, I am sure, have hesitated to usurp the function of the Roman authorities to qualify an Archbishop's pronouncement, and would have abstained from using the language which appears over his signature.

“2. In the *London Weekly Register*, of the 6th February, 1875, I find the following:—‘The Catholics of Ireland, we are rejoiced to know, are preparing to celebrate with befitting honour the fifty years' episcopal dignity of the Most Rev. John MacHale.’ That there was to be a celebration, then, was well known throughout Ireland. Can it have been unknown in the neighbourhood of Tuam ? So much for the *fact*, now as to the *date*, of the celebration. The following letter of the Archbishop, published at the time with editorial comments in the public newspapers, will throw light on this point:—

“ ‘ ST. JARLATH'S, TUAM,
“ ‘ *January 2nd*, 1875. ”

“ ‘ VERY REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Having read some of the kind letters of your correspondents, several of them from priests in England, expressing their desire to know the exact day of this year on which the fiftieth anniversary of my episcopal consecration comes round, with a view, they add, of joining by a testimonial in its celebration, I beg you to signify to them that the exact anniversary day will be the 5th of June, which in the year 1825

fell on Sunday within the octave of Corpus Christi, but which on this year I deem right to transfer to Tuesday the 8th, for the convenience of the faithful of the diocese. For the prayers of the faithful on the solemn occasion, which I humbly and earnestly crave, I will feel most grateful; but for a testimonial in any pecuniary shape, I beg most respectfully to decline any such, appreciating at the same time the kind feelings from which the suggestions of such a tribute have issued.

“ ‘Your faithful servant,

“ ‘(Signed) ✠ JOHN MACHALE.”

“ Now this letter is dated on the 2nd day of the year 1875, and was in reply to communications received by the Archbishop during the year 1874, and I am in a position to say, that such communications came pouring in even so early as August, 1874. If, therefore, the Catholics of Ireland were preparing to celebrate his jubilee, and if people at a distance in England and elsewhere, admirers of the Archbishop, in their anxiety to do him honour, went to the trouble of seeking for information many months before, as to the exact date of the celebration, what are we to say of others nearer home, who only six months previous to it, profess to have had absolutely no ‘idea of the time when the jubilee was to be celebrated’? Was not the actual date of the Archbishop’s consecration known by most Irish ecclesiastics, especially by those of them who lived for many years under his Grace’s immediate jurisdiction? Was it not most natural to presume that the date of the jubilee celebration would be fixed as closely as possible to the anniversary date? Yet it was the Galway Retreat that was fixed for that day! Your impartial readers will, I think, be forced to the conclusion, that such a coincidence was not the result of chance, and that those who fixed the date of the Retreat studiously ignored that of the approaching solemnity.

“ 3. It may perhaps be said that once the time for the Retreat at Galway was determined on, the arrangement could not have been interfered with without serious inconvenience to the Most Rev. Dr. Lynch. Are we then to suppose that in the year of grace, 1875, there was not to be found in all Ireland anyone to do the Galway clergy the charity of preaching their Retreat a week sooner or a week later than the jubilee week, reserving the services of his Lordship of Kildare for some other year? Every one knows that ‘where there’s a will there’s a way.’

“ 4. As to the ‘golden maxim—*audi alteram partem*’ I may state that the author of the *Life* would have been glad to listen,

if the *altera pars* chose to speak when the opportunity was offered him.

"It is on the principle of that 'golden maxim' that I beg to claim the insertion of this rejoinder, for which accept my best thanks beforehand, and believe me,

"Faithfully yours,

"THOMAS MACHALE."

THE STOWE MISSAL.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR,—The generous, albeit exaggerated, recognition accorded in the current number of the I. E. RECORD to my edition of the *Stowe Missal*, it were ungracious not to acknowledge. For the rest, the essay in question contains some matters of inference and fact which the data scarcely seem to warrant.

With respect to the fratricide laid to the charge of Donnchad, son of Brian Boru, I had before me the note in the Rolls' edition of the *Chronicon Scotorum*. But against the reading there given (to omit O'Connor, who in a linguistic or historical question counts for nothing) there was the Dublin transcript of the Bodleian MS. In addition, for grammatical reasons, which it was unnecessary to set forth, no option remained but to conclude that the original lection signified *submission*, not *instigation*. The Bodleian text is itself notoriously corrupt; so much so, indeed, in the present instance, that the *Four Masters*, as elsewhere, inserted from themselves the word without which the expression could not indisputably mean *to instigate*! Besides, all the extant native authorities, with the notable inclusion of the provincial chronicle, the *Annals of Innisfallen*, are silent respecting fratricide in connexion with the deposition of Donnchad.

As regards the age of the *Missal*, it is inferred that I date the older part of the MS. in the fifth century, because I agree with Dr. Todd that the character in which it is written may be deemed older than the sixth century. But, to take a parallel case, one could say the same of a Frankish document executed in Merovingian Cursive, without referring it thereby to the age of Merovæus.

His Lordship goes on to assert that the MS. was most probably written about the middle of the sixth century. This can be easily determined. For, as I pointed out (*Stowe Missal*, page 165), the name of Justus, fourth archbishop of Canterbury, occurs in the original part of the text. His death took place in 627. The transcription of the portion in question cannot, accordingly, date farther back than the second quarter of the seventh century

Similarly (*ib.*, pp. 166, 167), St. Samthann, of Clonbroney, county Longford, is invoked in the added Litany. As this virgin died A.D. 739, Moelcaich's work was executed, at the earliest, in the first half of the eighth century.

The *Cursus Scottorum*, it could not be well denied, signified the Office. "But then [first half of seventh century], as now, the rule was that the Mass corresponded with the Office, and hence what is said of the *cursus* may be understood of the entire liturgy, including the Mass." This inference, it may be admitted, is ingenious, and, as far as I know, original. But, in the first place, the existence and extent of the correspondence at the time remain to be proved. Secondly, correspondence does not imply inclusion; rather, it imports the contrary. It has consequently to be shown by direct proof that *cursus* was not strictly tied up to express the Office, but was employed, in addition, to signify the Mass. In connection herewith, it may not be deemed out of place to quote the conclusion arrived at by me after the best consideration I could give to the subject.

"The truth is, that Tract [containing the account of the *Cursus Scottorum*], as its first publisher, Spelman,¹ rightly understood, does not deal with the liturgy at all, but with the Office, or Celebration of the Canonical Hours.

"Two proofs will here suffice. The author lived probably towards the beginning, or first quarter, of the seventh century—a disciple of St. Columbanus. Well, the seventh chapter of that Patriarch's rule begins: 'De Synaxi, ergo, id est, de cursu psal-morum et orationum modo canonico.' Throughout the chapter, *Synaxis* and *Cursus* are used as convertible terms—the former, three; and the latter, five times.

"The Synodical Discourse to be announced to parish priests in every Synod, a fragment of which is preserved in *Lebar Breac*, contains the two following injunctions,² in which the distinction between *Cursus* and *Missa* could not be more clearly expressed:—*Cursum vestrum horis certis decantate. Missarum celebrationes religiose peragite.*

"If additional evidence be desired, time can be profitably spent in studying the quotations and verifying the references, more than half a column long, under the word *Cursus*, in *Du Cange*."³ (*Stowe Missal*, page 157.)

I considered it superfluous to add Menard's note on *Cursus*,

¹ *Conc. Gc.*, London, 1639, i. 167.

³ *L. B.*, 248 a.

² *Bib. Max. Patr.*, xii. 4

⁴ Col. 1319, 1320.

in his edition of the *Concordia Regularum* (lii. 34): *Cursus est id quod vulgo dicitur divinum officium, horae canonicae, opus Dei, pensum divini officii, quod a monachis quotidie excurritur et persolvitur.* He adds two references and seven quotations in support of the definition.

To come to the Tract in question, take the following, for instance:—*Inde per diversorum prudentium virorum et modulationibus, series Scripturarum Novi ac Veteris Testamenti diversorum prudentium virorum paginis, non de propriis sed de Sacris Scripturis reciproca, antiphonas et responsus, seu sonus et allelujas composuerunt.* Where, it is essential to inquire, is the Mass which “corresponds” to these data?

Again: *Est et alius cursus beati Benedicti, qui ipsum singulariter pauco discordante a cursu Romano [composuit?]: in sua regula repperies scriptum.* Where once more, will you find a Mass “written” in the Rule of St. Benedict?

But it is perhaps unreasonable to expect accuracy on such matters from a writer who (followed by Cardinal Moran and the I. E. RECORD essayist) gravely asserts that St. Basil was brother of St. Gregory Nazianzen!

The original portion of the *Missal*, it is said, may represent a liturgy older than the Gelasian recension. On the contrary, we have to regret that, as will be seen immediately, in common with every known copy of the Gelasian Canon, it exhibits the three clauses (*dies—numerari*) attributed to Gregory the Great, the next liturgical reviser after Gelasius. Moreover, in what Roman recension, old or new, is the following remarkable interpolation (in the original hand) to be found?—

Gelasian Canon.

(Reichenau MS., no. 1.)

Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae, quaesumus, Domine, placatus accipias, diesque nostros in tua pace dispone atque ab aeterna damnatione nos eripias et in electorum tuorum iubeas grege numerari. Per Christum, Dominum nostrum.

Stowe Missal, folio 25 a, b.

(The modernized text is employed.)

Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae quam tibi offerimus in honorem Domini nostri, Jesu Christi, et in commemorationem beatorum martyrum tuorum, in hac ecclesia, quam famulus tuus ad honorem nominis gloriae tuae aedificavit, quaesumus, Domine, ut placatus suscipias, eumque atque omnem populum ab idolorum cultura eripias, et ad te Deum verum, Patrem omnipotentem, convertas; dies quoque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab aeterna damnatione nos eripias, et in electorum tuorum iubeas grege numerari. Per Dominum nostrum.

"This is strongly confirmed by the fact that the old canon of the *Missal* has been erased, and the Gelasian Canon written in by the second hand, who flourished at a much later period." Reference to the printed text (in which the erased portions are put in italics) will, on the contrary, show at a glance that the greater part of the Gelasian Canon (from *et memoriam venerantes*, folio 24 b, to *per omnia secula seculorum*, before the *Pater noster*, folio 32 a) is preserved intact, as written by the first hand.

"It also shows that these more recent changes in the *Missal* were made to bring it into conformity not with any oriental or Gallican rite, but with the later emendations of the Roman liturgy." "Later emendations" here, probably, signify the Gelasian Canon. If so, they were, as we have seen, introduced by the older hand. As to the object of the changes made in the Canon, I have not asserted, or intended to convey, that they were effected to make the Gelasian conform to any oriental rite. I have directed attention (page 157) to the very remarkable fact that two of the non-Gelasian portions are respectively the substance and enlargement of two items of the Clementine liturgy. Surely, his Lordship does not consider the Clementine to be an oriental rite?

That the changes were made to bring the Gelasian into conformity with the Gallican use, is, I beg to submit, amply proved respecting the old hand, by the fact that he divided the canon in order to insert the long prayer, *Cum—novit* (folio 27a—folio 31 a), between *in somno pacis* and *ipsis et omnibus*, &c. This interpolation corresponds with the Gallican *Post Secreta*, and is the *Consueta Deprecatio* of Adamnan (*Vita Columbae*, iii. 12.)

As to the second hand, he erased the Canon in order to insert, amongst other additions, a prayer made up for the greater part of a Gallican *Post Nomina* and a Gallican *Post Sanctus*, after *pro redemptione animarum suarum* (folio 22 b—folio 23 b). But, after all, it may well be deemed superfluous to elaborate proof of these alterations, in the light of the fact that every known transcript of the Gelasian Canon has been to some extent accommodated to the Gallican use.

With respect to the charge brought against Eustasius (*missarum solemnna multiplicatione orationum vel collectarum celebrabat*) the true reading is given by Mabillon (quoted in the *Stowe, Missal*, page 176): *sacra missarum solemnna orationum et collectarum multiplici varietate celebrarent*. For the "multiplied variety" here intended, see page 154 of the *Missal*.

Apart from the foregoing questions, the present discussion cannot fail to be productive of good; if it leads students to investigate for themselves the sole surviving monument of our early liturgy that is at once authentic and complete—Yours faithfully,

B. MACCARTHY.

YOUGHAL, February 7, 1891.

CORRECTIONS:—In February number, page 155, line 28, for “which,” read “whom;” line 29, omit “give a deal to perceive it.”

Documents.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII. ON THE TERCENTENARY OF ST. ALOYSIUS.

SUMMARY.

The excellence of devotion to St. Aloysius.—Its admirable fruits.—Special celebration of his Feast this year in honour of his tercentenary.

Special indulgences.—A Plenary Indulgence granted to those who attend each day at the Triduum Devotions, or five times, at least, at the Novena preparatory to the feast, and who, having confessed and communicated, shall devoutly visit a church or public Oratory where the Feast of St. Aloysius is being celebrated, and there pray for concord among Christian princes, the up-rooting of heresy, the conversion of sinners, and the exaltation of Holy Church.

An indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines granted to those who being contrite of heart, make a pious visit to the places already named, and to youth, and the parents of such youth, who enrol themselves among the clients of St. Aloysius, and attend at the Triduum or Novena, as already mentioned.

LEO PP. XIII.

Universis Christifidelibus præsentes Litteras inspecturis salutem et Benedictionem Apostolicam.

Opportune quidem et auspiciato contingit ut XI. kalendas julias hoc anno sacra sollemnia in honorem Sancti ALOISII GONZAGAE trium saeculorum a beatissimo exitu eius elapso spatio sint memori pietate peragenda. Nuntiatum Nobis est, ex faustitate huius eventus mirabili amore pietatisque studio exarsisse

animos christianorum adolescentium, quibus optima sane huiusmodi occasio visa est, ut suam in caelestem iuventutis Patronum voluntatem et reverentiam multiplici significatione testarentur. Et id quidem evenire videtur non in iis tantum regionibus quae sanctum Aloisium terris caeloque genuere, sed late ubicumque Aloisii nomen et sanctitatis fama percrebuit. Nos iam a tenera aetate angelicum Iuvenem summo pietatis studio colere assueti, cum haec novimus, perjucundo laetitiae sensu affecti sumus.

Deo autem opitulante confidimus eiusmodi sollemnia non vacua futura fructu christianis hominibus, nominatim adolescentibus qui Patrono tutelari suo honores cum habebunt, in cogitationem facile deducuntur clarissimarum virtutum quibus Ille quoad vixit ceteris in exemplum enituit. Quas quidem virtutes cum secum cogitent et admirentur, sperandum est fore ut adiuvante Deo animum mentemque suam ad eas velint informare, studeantque fieri imitatione meliores. Neque certe catholicis iuvenibus proponi potest praestantius ad imitandum exemplum illisque locupletius virtutibus quarum laude florere iuvenilem aetatem desiderari maxime solet. Ex vita enim et moribus Aloisii posunt adolescentes documenta plurima capere, unde ediscant qua cura et vigilantia vitae integritas et innocentia sit servanda, qua constantia castigandum corpus ad restringendos cupiditatum ardores, quomodo despiciendae divitiae contemnendique honores, qua mente atque animo tum studiis vacandum tum cetera omnia aetatis suae officia et munia implenda, quodque his praesertim temporibus maximi est momenti, qua fide, quo amore sit Ecclesiae matri et Apostolicae Sedi adhaerendum. Siquidem Angelicus Adolescens seu domesticos inter parietes degeret, seu nobilis ephebus in Aula Hispanica versaretur, seu animo virtute et doctrina excolendo operam daret in Societatem Iesu abdicato principatu adseitus, ubi quod in votis habuerat et praeclusum dignitatibus aditum et vitam omnem proximorum saluti sibi unice impendendam esse gestiebat, talem in omni vitae genere sese impertiit, ut facile ceteris omni laude antecelleret et praeclara relinqueret sanctitatis argumenta.

Quapropter sapienti sane consilio qui christianae iuventuti instituendae et erudiendae praeficiuntur, sanctum Aloisium proponere solent tamquam nobilissimum ad imitandum exemplum, obsequentes consilio decessoris Nostri Benedicti XIII. qui iuventuti studiis deditae praecipuum Patronum caelestem Aloisium constituit. Quare egregiam sane meritorum laudem sibi comparare

videntur illae catholicorum iuvenum societates, quae non modo in italicis sed etiam in externis urbibus sunt institutae eo proposito, ut huiusmodi Aloisiana sollemnitas singulari cultu celebretur. Nos non latet quantum studii operaeque illae contulerint in apparandis honoribus qui toto orbe catholico Angelico Juveni deferentur et quantam adhibeant curam ut catholicorum pietate pariter ac numero praestent piae peregrinationes vel ad natale solum Aloisii vel ad hanc alman Urbem quae castas eius exuvias asservat et colit, suscipiendae.

Pueris etiam, ut accepimus, puellisque oblata est ratio testandi Aloisio puri amoris et pietatis suae quasi primitias: pagellae enim late sunt diffusae, augustis iam nobilitatae Nominibus, in quibus ipsi se parentesque tamquam famulos et clientes inscribant. Singulari huic in re optima ardori et sanctis eiusmodi propositis et votis cupimus atque optamus ut bonus faustusque iuvante Deo exitus obtingat. Interea cum admotae nuper sint ad Nos preces ut in uberiores animarum fructum caelestibus Ecclesiae thesauris hanc sollemnitatem ditare et decorare velimus, Nos piis hisce precibus benigne adnuendum censuimus.

Quamobrem de Omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli App. Eius auctoritate confisi, omnibus et singulis utriusque sextus Christifidelibus qui triduanas quotidie, vel quinquies saltem novendialibus supplicationibus quae habendae sunt ante Aloisiana sollemnia diebus a respectivo loci Ordinario designandis, et vel ipso die festo, vel uno ex dictis diebus ad cuiuscumque arbitrium sibi eligendo, vere poenitentes atque confessi ac S. Communionem refecti quamlibet Ecclesiam seu Oratorium publicum, ubi festum S. Aloisii celebrabitur, devote visitaverint, ibique pro christianorum Principum concordia, haeresum extirpatione, peccatorum conversione ac S. Matris Ecclesiae exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effuderint, Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum Indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Iis vero fidelibus qui corde saltem contriti pias peregrinationes ad memorata loca confecerint, et parvulis etiam pro eorum captu eorumque parentibus qui nomina ad promerendum Aloisii patrocinium inscripserint, dummodo triduanis vel novendialibus supplicationibus, ut supra dictum est, adstiterint, septem annos totidemque quadragenas in forma Ecclesiae consueta relaxamus. Quas omnes et singulas indulgentias, peccatorum remissiones ac poenitentiarum relaxationes etiam animabus christifidelium, quae Deo

in charitate coniunctae ab hac luce migraverint, per modum suffragii applicari posse indulgemus. Praesentibus hoc anno tantum valituris.

Volumus autem ut praesentium Litterarum transumptis seu exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhibetur, ipsis praesentibus, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae. Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die I. Ianuari MDCCCXCI. Pontificatus nostri anno XIII.

M. CARD. LEDOCHOWSKI.

LETTER OF HIS EMINENCE THE CARDINAL PREFECT OF
PROPAGANDA ON THE ANNUAL COLLECTION FOR THE PRO-
TECTION OF THE SANCTUARIES OF THE HOLY LAND.

SUMMARY.

Funds much needed for the repair, protection, and administration of the Shrines of the Holy Land.

A Collection for this purpose is to be made annually on Good Friday, or, if more convenient, on some other day in the course of the year.

The amount of the collection is to be sent to the Rev. Father of the Order of St. Francis, who is appointed for this purpose Commissary of the Holy Land.

Die 20 Februarii 1891.

ILLME ET REVME DOMINE,

Haud ita pridem hoc Sacram Consilium Christiano Nomini propagando diligenter ad examen revocavit ea omnia quae ad necessitates Missionum Palaestinae, quaeque ad regimen et moderationem arcae a Fratribus Minoribus Franciscalibus in Locorum Sanctorum curam custodiamque administratae referuntur. Hac opportunitate petitiones Apostolicae Sedi porrectae circa eadem argumenta exhibitae sunt. Enimvero exploratum est, inspectis temporum nostrorum circumstantiis, auctaque itinerum facilitate, desiderium inter fideles quotidie magis exardescere ea loca visendi, quae Salvator Noster CHRISTUS Dominus praesentia sua, ac praedicatione, potissimum vero morte ac Sepulcro suo nobilissima imprimis reddidit, eaque de causa ingentes sane expensas ad peregrinos hospitio recipiendos exigi: insuper Sanctuariis conservandis, restaurandis, scholis erigendis missionibus provehendis haud exigam pecuniae vim requiri.

Ad administrationem verò collectae stipis oculos convertens, eam reperit esse tanto ponderi plane imparem. Decennio quippe mox elapso diligenter inspecto, vim reddituum custodiæ Terræ Sanctae vix ad decies centena millia libellarum pervenire intellexit. Qui quidem ex triplici fonte derivantur. Pars siquidem illius summae ex oblationibus ad sanctuarium, ex juribus stolae, et eleemosynis missarum, quae a Franciscalibus celebrantur, proveniunt: pars ex collectis, quas in universo orbe Fratres ipsi industria sua perficiunt: pars denique ex eleemosynis, quae Feria VI. in Parasceve in omnium gentium ecclesiis colliguntur. Haec porro postrema pars non nisi exiguam portionem totius redditus, quae nimirum tertiam partem illius certe non excedit, complectitur. In ea vero conferenda stipe Americae et Europae gentes aequae concurrunt. Ad quam pecuniam diligenter ac studiose administrandam jam a pluribus saeculis benemerens Ordo Minorum magna cum laude incubuit; dum fidem Catholicam duris exantlatis laboribus, fusoque sanguine, praeclari sui Fundatoris vestigiis inhaerens, per totam Palaestinam, Syriam, atque Aegyptum amplificavit. Quapropter Apostolica Sedes nedum religiosos hujusmodi viros benevolentia ac beneficiis suis nullo non tempore cumulavit, verum ipsum Terrae Sanctae Pium Opus non unius nationis proprium sed internationale constituit, quo ea, quae illius intersunt, vigilantiae religiosorum virorum ex diversis nationibus credita communi veluti praecipuarum Europae gentium studio procurentur: tantumque administrationis negotium sibi obnoxium declaravit.

Ea itaque omnia considerans S. Congregatio, et curam prorsus singularem rerum ad Terram Sanctam pertinentium sibi a Summo Pontifice commissam esse sciens, Eodem adprobante declarandum censuit, uti per praesentes declarat, administrationem arcae Custodiæ Terra Sanctae sub sua speciali tutela esse constitutam, sibi quoque negotiorum quoad eam gestorum uti antea ita in posterum esse quotannis reddendam rationem, ut a se examinetur et a Summo Pontifice adprobetur. Hoc scilicet modo debita oblationum ratio habebitur, quaeque ad nova aedificia extruenda, vetera amplificanda, caeteraque gravia in quoscumque usus dispendia pertinent, S. Consilium accuratae disceptationi subjiciet, ipsisque religiosis viris, SSmo D. N. sanciente, perficienda committet.

Ut vero commodius oblationum collectae fiant, mandatur ut apostolicae literae die 26 Decembris 1888 datae, quae incipiunt

Salvatoris ab universis ad quos pertinent omnino ad executionem mittantur, collectaeque eleemosynarum una vice singulis annis Feria VI. in Parasceve, vel alio quolibet intra annum die pro Terrae Sancta faciendae non debeant quomodolibet ad alios usus converti atque applicari, sed integrae ad Revmum P. Custodem Terrae Sanctae per Commissarios Ordini SS. Francisci¹ ex omnibus orbis regionibus diligenter transmitti, quacumque dispensatione exinde revocata.

Quoniam vero studiosissime satagendum est ne in Palaestinae regione praeter ea quae ab antiquo recognita sunt, nova Sanctuaria aut recenter inventa, aut in posterum detegenda inconsiderate adstruantur, absolute vetat hoc S. Consilium ne quis uti authentica prodat ejusmodi Sanctuaria vel eorum cultum permittat, quin idem Consilium ea super re judicium edat, ac sententia sua ut talia recognoscat ac probet.

Haec A. T. gravissima hac super re significanda erant : interea vero D. O. M. vehementer adprecor ut omnia fausta felicia tibi fidelibusque curae tuae creditis concedat.

Addictissimus uti frater

J. CARD. SIMEONI, *Prefectus*.

✠ D. ARCHIEP. TYRENSIS, *a Secretis*.

Notices of Books.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUFFERINGS OF EIGHTEEN CARTHUSIANS IN ENGLAND. Translated from the Latin of Dom Maurice Chauncy. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. 1890.

THE short but highly interesting narrative, of which the present is a translation, was written by Dom Chauncy, himself a Carthusian, after the year 1541. The original Latin was republished in England about two years ago, and created a profound impression, as well in Protestant as in Catholic circles, by its simple and unadorned statement of the cruel sufferings endured for conscience' sake by the monks of the London Charter House. But as it was desirable that the narrative should reach a circle of readers wider than that for which the original Latin

¹The Commissary in Ireland is Very Rev. M. A. Cavanagh, O.S.F., Franciscan Convent, Drogheda.

was intended, the editors have had the present translation made and published.

Dom Maurice Chauncy began his novitiate in the London Charter House in the year 1531.¹ The Anglican schism broke out in 1533, and the eighteen fathers and brothers, with one exception, were put to death in the two years 1535-37. Hence, this is the narrative of an eye-witness. The origin of the dispute between King Henry VIII. and the Pope is well known; and, viewed from a distance of three and a-half centuries, it appears inconceivable how he was able to carry with him almost the entire people of England, lay and ecclesiastical. But if we reflect on the means employed by the king, and the false issues that were presented to the people by his willing tools, we shall not be astonished, but rather pray lest by analogous methods a similar catastrophe may be precipitated in our own day.

It was represented to the people that Henry's claims did not touch the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope, but were only such as a temporal king might justly demand. In other words, the question at issue, it was said, was not one of "morals but of politics," as some modern "Reformers"; are in the habit of saying regarding living issues. This view would still seem to find favour with English Protestants if we may judge from a statement made in a leader in *The Times* of May 21, 1873. The writer in drawing a parallel between the struggle against the papacy maintained by Henry VIII., in the sixteenth century, and that in which Prince Bismarck was then engaged, says: "With us then, as with Prince Bismarck now, the struggle with Romanism was essentially *political*." Deceived by this specious but insidious fallacy, the clergy submitted *as far as the law of Christ would permit them*; and with the clergy, the laity also submitted on the same tacit condition. But all compromise of principle, or equivocation regarding the laws of God or of the Church brings with it its own punishment. The people were bewildered; the king and his satellites who were plotting a complete rupture with Rome were strengthened; and the clergy, having made the first concession, were confounded to hear their own words and actions used as arguments for setting aside the Pope altogether. If a priest warned his people of the danger to his Faith, he was told to mind his own business, and the sixteenth-century equivalent for "no priests in politics" was often muttered or loudly proclaimed. The bulk of the clergy suc-

ceeded in arguing themselves into the belief that they might follow Henry without leaving the one true fold. Of this number was Dom Maurice Chaucey. But he soon repented, and spent the remaining years of his life in making atonement for his sin.

The narrative, we have said, is profoundly interesting. The writer begins by giving us a picture of life at the Charter House. And such does he represent the mortification, the obedience, and the charity of the monks to have been, that we do not feel the least surprise to learn that eighteen out of forty-eight gained the crown of martyrdom. Many of the monks had attained a very high degree of perfection, and were often vouchsafed revelations; and such was the sanctity pervading the entire monastery, that it was not rarely the scene of extraordinary miracles, some of which the writer himself witnessed. Peculiarly affecting, and at the same time most edifying, is the account of the preparations which the whole community of the Charter House made for death, after having in solemn conference resolved to resist the edict of the king rejecting the spiritual headship of the Pope.

There is a curious mistake in the introduction by the editor. He says the narrative was written about 1539, whereas on page 69 is given an account of the martyrdom of one of the lay brothers, which, according to the writer, happened in 1541. And though the editor points out that this brother was put to death in 1540, it does not follow that the account of it could have been penned in 1539. On the contrary, seeing that Dom Chauncy has mistaken the year, would it not appear that he must have written the narrative several years after the event?

SAINT ANASTASIA, VIRGIN AND MARTYR. By Margaret Howitt. London: Burns & Oates.

THE subject of this short history is one of the most remarkable, and most highly honoured of the early martyrs. Her name occurs in the Litany of Saints, and in the Canon of the Mass, and she is commemorated in the second Mass on Christmas Day. The Church dedicated to her in Rome, and in which her ashes repose, was, in the centuries succeeding her martyrdom, held in the highest honour and reverence. The Popes were wont to walk barefooted to this church twice each year, and to celebrate in it the Mass on Christmas Day, in which the commemoration of the holy martyr occurs. After a heroic life spent in ministering to the spiritual and temporal wants of the persecuted Christians, Anastasia suffered death by fire in the persecution of Diocletian,

about A.D. 303. This little biography, compiled from an Italian "Life," presents in a very readable form the chief incidents in the brief but noble life of the virgin martyr, together with edifying accounts of many other martyrs to whom she had ministered or with whom she was connected by ties of Christian friendship.

AIDS TO CORRECT AND EFFECTIVE ELOCUTION, WITH
SELECTED READINGS AND RECITATIONS. By Eleanor
O'Grady. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1890.

IN the theoretical part of this book Miss O'Grady makes a fairly successful attempt to construct a scientific basis for elocution. Gesture and speech are the two elements which combine to make elocution. Of these, the former, according to Miss O'Grady, should always precede the latter, and the gesture of the face should precede that of the hand. The six laws of gesture given by Delaumosare are stated and explained. But unless American students have penetrated much farther into the science of elocution than we have, it is to be feared that some parts of Miss O'Grady's explanations will be barely intelligible even to them. Thus, for instance, she says, speaking of bowing:—

"Bowing, kneeling, and seating one's self, are accomplished by observing the law of *poise*, or 'Opposition of Agents.' The law consists in placing the acting levers in opposition, and thus realizing *equilibrium*." The "Selections" have been chosen with great care with a view to illustrate the theory, and many of them will be new to most readers in this country. Some of them are in prose, some in verse, some are serious, some humorous, and all are interesting and instructive.

THE PERFECTION OF MAN BY CHARITY. By Fr. H. Reginald
Buckler, O.P. London: Burns & Oates. New York:
Catholic Publication Society Company.

THIS work, the author tells us, has been written mainly for religious persons; with the hope, however, that the general principles and plan of the work may be acceptable to ecclesiastics generally, and to pastors of souls in particular. Many of our modern ascetical works are but a collection of pointless platitudes, or weak thoughts strung together without order, or any well-defined object. They profess to point out the path to perfection,

but ever and anon they keep turning away from the track they have chosen, into lanes and by-ways for the purpose of pursuing some stray and oftentimes irrelevant thought that had crossed the writer's mind. The present work is not one of these. Its object, clearly expressed in the title, is kept constantly before the reader, and all the arguments and illustrations are directed to showing how perfection depends on charity, and how persons may become perfect through charity. Though in the highest and lowest sense of the word a theological work, it is quite free from merely technical terms, and is withal written in an easy, graceful, and familiar style. For his matter, the author has gone to the very sources of theology; namely, the Scriptures, the doctrines of the Church, the writings of the Fathers, and of the great Scholastics. Of the last category he quotes most largely, as might be expected, from the angel and the seraph of the schools, the great saints, Thomas and Bonaventure. We earnestly hope that this book may reach those for whom it is intended, and that it may fill them with that charity *quae nunquam excidit*.

THE VENERABLE SIR ADRIAN FORTESCUE, MARTYR. By Father John Morris, S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

SIR ADRIAN FORTESCUE was one of those who resisted the absurd and impious pretensions of Henry VIII. to the spiritual headship of the Church in England. Born in 1476, of a knightly family, whose members had served the kings of England both in the field and in the council chamber, Sir Adrian seems to have nobly preserved the traditions of his race. By command of King Henry he accompanied his noble but unhappy Queen, Catherine of Arragon, to the Field of the Cloth of Gold; and very shortly afterwards he took part in a twenty-one weeks' campaign against France, in which he must have seen very sharp fighting. But neither his fidelity to the king, nor his kinship with the unfortunate Anne Boleyn, whose first cousin he was, sufficed to excuse him to the tyrant king for refusing to recognise him as supreme head of the Church. With another noble knight, Sir Thomas Dingley, he was beheaded on Tower Hill in 1539; thus by his heroic defence of the one true Faith, giving to his name and his motto—*forte scutum*—a higher and holier signification than it previously possessed. Father Morris has made this brochure very interesting by his numerous quotations from a domestic account-book kept by Sir Adrian, and from other contemporary documents.

THE HARP OF JESUS. A PRAYER-BOOK IN VERSE. By the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1890.

THE Author's short Preface, in which he explains the peculiar title of this booklet, and the purpose it is intended to serve, is itself the most appropriate notice. We, therefore, transcribe it without apology :—

“The letters of *Eucharistia* may be so transposed as to form *Cithara Jesu*. This anagram and this hidden meaning suggested the name of this very peculiar little Prayer-book—a name which has the additional attraction of being associated with our Island of the Sacred Heart, whose symbol is the harp.

“The metrical form of these prayers may help children—and perhaps, too, some “children of a larger growth”—to learn a few of them by heart, and they may occur to the memory in moments when ordinary prayers would not be available. The unusualness of the form, also, may be of use in fixing attention on thoughts that are happily very familiar. This little book may thus aid some souls in fulfilling better the supreme duty of life, which is prayer.”

Though small, this Prayer-book contains a varied collection of prayers, among which will be found suitable ones for nearly all the different circumstances and conditions of life. These prayers, together with the graceful versification of which Father Russell is such a master, are remarkable for their deep pathos, their genuine piety, and soundness of doctrine, all distinctive attributes of their author's writings.

LITTLE NELL. A Sketch. By Frances Noble. Burns & Oates.

THIS sketch, by the author of *Gertrude Mannering*, gives a very vivid picture of the agony endured by a father, who refused to forgive his daughter for having married a Protestant. Her death, soon after the marriage, opened his eyes to the folly of his course, and the love which he denied his daughter is lavished on her only child, who proves worthy of it, and who having become a Sister of Mercy, is sent by her superiors to console him in his last illness. The story is very well told, and will supply two or three hours' interesting reading.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

MAY, 1891.

THE OFFICE OF REASON IN THEOLOGY.

THE contemptuous epithet of "Dark Ages," so long and so unreasonably applied to the mediæval period, is now happily going out of use. But if the more tolerant men of to-day graciously allow some excellence in earlier generations, they are still very far from losing sight of their own superior merits. They have gained sufficient "sweetness" to abstain from harsh language, but they, nevertheless, continue to regard the "light" as something peculiarly their own. The interest awakened by the mediæval, or still earlier periods, is not unmixed with pity. And the present century, in contrast with all its predecessors, is spoken of as this "enlightened age." The world, it would seem, has passed its term of childhood and reached the years of reason. Faith and credulity and superstition have gone their way. We are wiser than our fathers; we ask for proof, not authority. Such are the professions of the day. Whether the claim to this superiority is warranted by facts is another matter.

If we confine our attention to the field of physical science and mechanical invention it will be easy to make good the claim. Who would envy the man who can look with apathy on the vast strides which science of this kind is making in our day? New realms are ever opening to our sight, and conquests won, which are full as splendid, and far more lasting, than any gained by arms. Beside the mighty fabric

of modern physical science, the physics of earlier days make a poor show, indeed. And it is no wonder that men who look only at this are led to speak of the present century as the age of enlightenment, and to think little of the methods and teaching which come from the past. Yet it is, surely, fairer and more reasonable to look further afield before joining in this worship of the age. If we do this we shall find that, after all, our boasted progress is mainly confined to one field of knowledge, and that by no means the highest or the most important.

Literature in all its forms, and art and philosophy, are tokens of enlightenment, to say the least, as trustworthy as physical science or mechanics. Can we dare to claim pre-eminence in all these? Are there not ancient marbles rightly called the "despair of modern art," and old masters beside whose works the best paintings of to-day fade into insignificance? Is there no ancient poetry which finds but a faint echo of its lofty strains in the few great singers who are still with us? And, having passed to another field, how would the "philosophy" of this age of light bear comparison with the real philosophy of Plato and St. Augustine, of St. Thomas and Aristotle? Truth to say, it would make as poor a show as the mediæval naturalist compared with Huxley and Darwin. Nay, we cannot make a fair comparison between them, for most of the truth and beauty to be found in modern writings is taken from the great thinkers of the past.

The tone of superiority assumed by so many writers of the day is thus hardly in keeping with facts. We are told, however, that earlier ages were distinguished by a credulous and blind trust to authority, whereas the present lives by reason and proof. But is this the case? Do men nowadays make better use of their reason than in the ages of faith? Take, for instance, the general acceptance of the teaching of science. Does this rest on severe and formal reasoning or actual experience of the facts which are admitted? Undoubtedly a large number of facts in natural science have been ascertained with certainty, and many of its conclusions are proved to demonstration. Yes, but for whom is this proof?

For all who accept the teaching? Surely not. Very few of the thousands who receive it without qualms, who take the words of Huxley and Darwin as gospel truth to measure heaven and earth withal, could give any proof of their teaching. Nay, there are many quite incapable of appreciating the force of the arguments when these are placed before them. Science, like religion, has its *ecclesia discens* and its *ecclesia docens*. Authority, after all, has more influence in our lives than we are aware of—more, maybe, than we care to acknowledge. Even in matters which are susceptible of strict proof most of us are content to go by faith. We accept the teaching of those who are masters of their several subjects, and go by reason only in so far as practical reason tells us that we do well to take their authority.

Now there is no reason to complain of the acceptance of scientific teaching on the authority of competent men. It would be the height of folly to reject and disbelieve all science which we have not proved for ourselves. Reason itself condemns such a course. For it is not only in strict proof and formal investigation that the voice of reason is heard: it is in the office of reason to weigh the credentials of an authority, and form a practical judgment as to its trustworthiness; and this reasonable belief is and must always be one of the most effective means of arriving at the truth. There is thus what may be called an element of faith in the wide-spread acceptance of modern physical science. Unhappily, credulity and superstition follow in its train. Because a man has made important discoveries, or has done other excellent work in the field of physics, he is practically taken as a guide and teacher, not merely on those matters on which he can claim to speak with authority, but on the higher subjects of philosophy and religion. No doubt there are some men who have been carried into the trackless desert of scepticism and unbelief by doubts and difficulties of their own. But it is likely that the number of those who have thus gone astray through the disordered workings of their own minds, is not by any means considerable. The hosts of fashionable Freethinkers and Agnostics, and Positivists and Atheists, are

really led by the influence of others. They may talk of reason, and smile at the simple credulity of darker ages, yet they are themselves the victims of a singular delusion, and afford one of the most striking examples of credulity and unreasoning faith that the world has seen. What, after all, is the ultimate basis of their assent to the form of unbelief which they affect? It is the word of some eminent man who has no claim to authority but his achievements in physical science, or the charm of his literary style. Popular agnosticism is really a creed, or rather a system of credulity.

In all this we see the natural result of the perversion of reason from its true office. The revolt against the just sway of lawful authority has ended in the tyranny of usurpers. If we turn from the disciples to the teachers, we shall find fresh tokens of the want of real rationalism. How do modern writers treat the old reasons for religion, whose force has been felt by so many great thinkers in the past? For the most part, with contempt. They tell us that these things cannot bear the light of modern science: their day is gone by. It is easy to dogmatize in this fashion. The wonder is, that men are so easily satisfied.

And somehow the world accepts the *ex cathedra* pronouncement without further inquiry. It is true, some writers are not content with mere assertion, and put forth certain conclusions of modern science as their reasons for rejecting religion. But these "reasons," however plausible they may seem at first sight, will not bear a close scrutiny. We may well wonder at the singular confusion of ideas which somehow attacks some of the most powerful minds whenever they come to deal with the relations of science with religion. No attempt is made to distinguish between theology itself and the opinions of those who happen to be its exponents; and thus the teaching of religion is supposed to be discredited by a discovery which only affects these private opinions on matters of natural science. A very little reflection would show that the views in question were no part of the doctrines with which they happened to be associated, and were shared in by others who had nothing to do with theology. On the other hand, the crude speculations of scientists are often

mixed up with the ascertained truths of science, and the one is taken for the other.

Confusion of this kind begets that unfortunate appearance of hostility between science and religion which is doing so much harm in our days. Some of the votaries of physical science, from whatever motive, seem bent on keeping up the delusion, and their writings are often tainted with something worse than the proverbial *odium theologicum*. It is much to be regretted that certain apologists, with more zeal than judgment, unwittingly second these efforts, and do what in them lies to associate the cause of orthodoxy with obscurantism. The evolution hypothesis affords a conspicuous example of the prevailing confusion of ideas. This theory is often used as a pretext for rejecting the teaching of religion; but it is surely a very sorry pretext. Those who take up this position are arguing from a mere hypothesis; no adequate reasons are forthcoming. Nay, the theory is from the nature of the case hardly capable of strict demonstration. The most that can be looked for is a certain show of probability. And when all is said and done it must still remain possible that some other hypothesis would account for all the facts which are now supposed to tell in favour of evolution.¹

This hypothetical character belongs to the very essence of the evolution theory. The form in which the theory is often put forth is open to far more serious objections. Thus the attempt to give a mere material origin to the rational soul of man is really something apart from the rest of the theory. It is not simply a variation in the species of animal life; it is a leap into a new order of being. The wonder is that those who can reconcile themselves to this, do not make an equally bold step at the other end of the series, and say that matter was evolved out of absolute nothingness. There is no use in shirking facts. If we take into account those things which man has in common with the beasts, we must not shut our eyes to the far more striking facts which mark him off as something very different from them. Professor

¹ There is, for instance, the alternative of "ideal evolution," on which see Hartmann's *Wahrheit und Irrthum im Darwinismus*, ii.

Mivart speaks the language of sound reason when he says:—

“To estimate any object *as a whole*, its powers of action no less than its structure must be taken into consideration. The structure of the highest plants is more complex than that of the lowest animals; but, for all that, powers are possessed by jelly fishes of which oaks and cedars are devoid. The self-conscious intelligence of man establishes between him and all other animals a distinction far wider than the mere superiority of his brain, in mass and complexity, or any other physical difference would indicate.”¹

Max Müller, in like manner, is well within the mark when he says that language forms a rubicon which no beast can cross. Language is the expression of a reasoning soul, and the sign of a life that is not of the slime of the earth.²

It is much to be feared that in many instances the evolution hypothesis is more readily adopted because of its supposed antagonism with the teaching of religion. It is welcomed as a substitute for creation, and a refutation of the old theistic arguments. In any case, this would not be a very rational ground of belief, and it could hardly preclude the necessity of other reasons, or of a full consideration of the objections to which the theory is open. But the real folly of this hasty acceptance of the hypothesis, as a stick to beat religion with, is only seen when we come to examine the supposed antagonism more closely. And here there is need of very careful discrimination. A theory in itself is one thing; the animus of its exponents is another. The mere fact that a science is largely cultivated and taught by men who are, unhappily, prejudiced against theology, tends to obscure the real point at issue, and to clothe scientific statements or hypotheses in an atheistic garb. Such has certainly been the case with the bold theory of Darwin and his followers; and it is no wonder if many among us are repelled by a system which is so constantly set before us in this hateful guise.

¹ *Lessons in Elementary Anatomy*, concluding remarks.

² It is worth remarking that Onkelos 'paraphrases Genesis ii. 7 by the words *והיה כבודו כדבר רוח מלא*. “And it became in Adam a speaking spirit.” Onkel., *Targum in Genes. ii. 7*.

But what, after all, is the real character of the hypothesis itself? What has it to say against religion? Nothing whatever. Not only is the hypothesis—so far as it is consonant with reason and experience—perfectly compatible with a real and living theism, but it leaves the old theistic arguments untouched. The reasons of St. John Damascene and St. Thomas would still have all their force if that theory were to receive a full demonstration to-morrow. After all, it leaves the great riddle still unsolved. It provides no substitute for creation. Even if we admit that the hypothesis explains, to some extent, how the various forms of animal life may have been evolved from primeval matter, it can tell us nothing of the origin of that prolific matter itself, or of the cause which first set it in motion. Behind the elaborate cosmogony of Haeckel and his fellows we come once more to the old problem, and creation is the only answer in which reason can at length find rest.

It may, perhaps, be urged that the evolution hypothesis is, at least, at variance with the account of creation given to us by revealed teaching. This is often asserted by writers of very different schools, but it has never been proved. One writer will identify "evolution" with all the extravagant views with which that unfortunate word has ever been associated. Others betray a conception of creation which is hopelessly at variance with sound theology. But it cannot matter two straws whether an unscientific theory of evolution, and an untheological conception of creation, are compatible with one another or not. The loose language often heard in such discussions would be very amusing, were it not for the fact that it helps to keep alive the superstition that science and theology are at feud, and so does incalculable harm. When once we get rid of the misconceptions and the confusion of ideas which, unhappily, prevail, it will be seen that the supposed antagonism has no reasonable foundation.

What are the main lines of the cosmogony shadowed forth in the opening chapters of Genesis? The world with all its wealth of life is described as being gradually evolved from a primeval chaos. One by one the different orders of

living things appear above the face of the earth, or rather come out from it. Life, and beauty, and order, are breathed into the dead and formless matter by Him whose word had made it out of nothing. Each successive elevation in the scale of life is the work of His power. We may thus imagine the Creator, like an artist or a sculptor, fashioning and moulding the work of His hands. But this is the language of metaphor; theology teaches us to remove all the imperfections and limitations from our ideas of the divine operations. God works all that He wills immediately by His divine power. The movement or change is all in the creature itself, which becomes all that He wills it to be.

If a knowledge of these elementary principles of theology were more common, we should be spared a good many aimless objections from modern opponents. Thus, Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his *First Principles of Biology*, tells us that no one has ever seen a special creation; and he goes on to argue that such creations were purposeless, because *ex hypothesi* they all took place when there was no man to see them. Well, let us suppose that a man had been made before his time in order that he might witness the work of creation. What would he have seen? What could he have seen? Nothing but the effects; the earth apparently of itself sending forth plants and trees from its prolific bosom, the waters teeming with life, and animals coming up out of the earth. Only reason and faith could tell this imaginary spectator that all these changes were the work of God; just as the same light tells us now that His hand upholds the creatures He has made, and in Him they live and move and have their being. It might have seemed that the earth and sea were themselves producing the living things which came forth from them. Nay, they were in some sense secondary causes. The different forms of animals and plants were not, strictly speaking, *created*. In the language of the schools, they were drawn forth from the capacity or potentiality of the matter. Some writers, it is true, explain this in a merely passive sense; but there are not wanting others who hold that an active power of fruitfulness was given to the

earth and sea. And the greatest of all theologians has favoured this view.¹

Now, what has modern science to say against this? Does it deny that God made the primeval matter? or does it give us some other first cause of life and movement? Nothing of the kind: physical science does not deal with such questions.

There is, moreover, much in the more plausible speculations of recent scientists that bears a singular resemblance to the development set forth in Holy Writ, and expounded by St. Augustine. The Augustinian cosmogony is, in the truest sense of the word, a system of evolution. What is there in the modern hypothesis which is wanting here? We may put aside those various errors and exaggerations which do not really belong to the theory itself. It will then appear that there is little new beyond the statement that the higher forms of life have passed through the lower forms in the course of their development from the primitive matter whence all have sprung. If science should ever show that this is the way in which the development is carried on, it will give us valuable information on a point of detail concerning which theology is silent. It will fill up some portions of the grand outline, but it will not otherwise affect the ancient account. It is really a minor matter, the importance of which has been strangely exaggerated.

St. Augustine's famous teaching on this point is luminously stated and supported by St. Thomas, *De Potentia Qu. IV.*, art. 2, in the answers to the 22nd and 28th of the first series of objections. St. Bonaventure's words, "*Materia est plena formis secundum rationes seminales*" (*Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*, c. 2), may be cited as connecting the scholastic axiom, "*formae educuntur de potentia materiae*," with the teaching of St. Augustine.

² Thus Berti says of the creation of plants and animals in their own proper forms: "*Istorum creatio perficitur in tempore et post sex illos dies invisibiles: spectatque ad dies naturales in quibus Deus operatur quotidie quicquid de illis tanquam involucris primordialibus in tempore evoluitur.*" (*De Theologicis Disciplinis*, l. xi., c. 2.) It is remarkable that this eminent Augustinian theologian of the last century clearly expressed his belief that modern philosophers would adopt the views of St. Augustine. "*Quapropter spem propositam habeo horum illustriores catervas magni Augustini placitis accessuras.*" (*Ibid.*, c. 3.) Whatever may be thought of the particular instance on which this prediction was based, it has certainly been strangely fulfilled. The writings of such an illustrious scientist as Professor Mivart have done much to satisfy Berti's expectations.

It is, if possible, even more unreasonable to make the origin of man's body a special ground for attacking revealed theology from the evolutionary standpoint. It is hardly too much to say that such attacks can only be effective on the supposition that theology has already been disproved. Surely no consistent theist can maintain that God could not by His almighty power make man *immediately* without the intervention of natural causes or natural laws. Hence, though all other living things were evolved, man may possibly be an exception. And when we consider the high destiny of man, we can hardly be surprised if we are told that there was something in the origin of even his lower nature which served to mark him off as a being of a higher order than the beasts of the field. What wonder if the clay, which was to be the abode and the instrument of an immortal soul, was quickened by no lower life before the rational spirit was breathed into it by its maker? Not, indeed, that man is something altogether apart from the rest of the animal world. If he is lifted above the beasts by his spiritual nature, and yet more by his supernatural destiny, he still has much in common with them. Writers like Haeckel seem to imagine that the relationship between man and the lower animals is something newly discovered, and they gloat over it as though it were a valuable weapon to turn against religion. As a matter of fact, this intimate connection between man and the rest of nature is a truth which may be read as plainly in the pages of theologians as in any treatise on biology. In Catholic theology man is the link between the material and the spiritual worlds. He is the summit of the visible creation, combining its various grades of life and being so as to be in a very real sense a microcosm in himself.¹ The priest as well as the king of material nature, he interprets its silent voice, and glorifies God in the name of all.

Hence we must not forget that man has a real kinship

¹ Lessius observes that for this reason the Incarnation was for the perfection of the universe: "Quia homine assumpto, totum, universum quodammodo assumptum et divinitati connexum." (*De Perfectionibus Moribusque Divinis*, lib. 12, cap. 4.)

with the animal and inanimate nature by which he is surrounded. He is, in truth, a part of it, in harmony with the rest, and holds a definite place in the order of animals. If, then, there was something exceptional in the origin of the first man, it could not be anything which would destroy this relationship. Suppose for the moment, that all other living things are the result of a gradual evolution; and suppose further, that man is specially and immediately created without passing through any lower ranks of life; then this special origin will surely be akin to a miraculous birth. Though not actually the result of the same forces which produced the rest of the animal world, he will still be made such as he would have been had he been evolved like the rest. He belongs to the genus animal, and resembles the other members of the family; hence he will bear in him those marks which in the other species are *ex hypothesi*, the tokens of the evolution which gave them birth. Only revelation can tell us that man was specially and immediately created. And if it does teach this, science can never gainsay it.

If the modern theory of evolution, when put in its only plausible form, is not in itself at variance with the teachings of revealed theology, it is not, for this reason, necessarily true. Further investigations may throw fresh light on what is now but dimly seen; and the popular theory, which has been so hastily adopted, may be as hastily abandoned.

But, in any case, the present treatment of this theory will remain a conspicuous example of the unreason of the age. No after proof or disproof can alter the fact that this hypothesis has been taken as the standard of truth, before it has been proved that it is put forth as the solution of questions which it does not even touch, and the refutation of doctrines with which it is, to all appearance, in perfect harmony.

It is a positive relief to turn from this subject to consider how reason fares, and what place it holds in Catholic philosophy and theology. Here, again, the first thing to be done is to clear away the false notions which are only too common in our day. The enemies of religion claim to be the champions of "reason," with what warrant we have already,

in some measure, seen. On the other hand, they do all that in them lies to make the Church appear the enemy of reason, and if repeated assertion can be taken to stand for proof, it must be allowed that they have made good their position. But we, surely, have a right to ask for something more. What are really the facts of the case? Does the Church deny the existence of the light of natural reason? Or does she forbid its exercise or trench upon its province? She does none of these things. It is true she tells us of doctrines beyond the view of natural reason which are the peculiar province of her authority; and when it is sought to drag these down and submit them to a tribunal incapable of judging them, she administers a timely rebuke. But it is, surely, a strange abuse of metaphor to speak of this as an enslavement of the mind, or to describe the rejection of this authority as an emancipation. Ignorance and prejudice and error are the only real fetters of the mind, for these hinder the free exercise of reason within its own sphere. But it is yet to be proved that Catholics have more than their share of these too common *impedimenta*.

The Church is very far from doing anything to question the power of reason to deal with natural science and other matters falling within its own range. On the contrary, she has ever cherished and sanctioned the sound and sensible philosophy which alone maintained the just prerogatives of reason. This is worth recalling in these days of materialism, and idealism, and agnosticism, and other systems which strike at the root of all knowledge and certainty, and cut away the foundations of physical science itself. This is no exaggeration of the effect of modern "philosophy" if once it is consistently applied. Let the "idealism," which tells us that nothing exists but the thinking subject, once gain ground, and what room is left for physics? The temple of physical science, reared with such infinite pains, will perish like the baseless fabric of a vision.

Nor is the opposite system of "materialism" less fatal to true science than the dreams of the idealist school. One denies the reality of its object: the other eliminates the thinking subject itself. And as external objects can only be

known by means of subjective faculties, the latter negation is really the more far-reaching of the two. It will ultimately lead to a denial of that objective reality which is for the time being still maintained.

It is true that not a few of the most distinguished labourers in the field of physical science affect a "philosophy" which is nothing less than materialism. And a superficial observer might be led to credit this barren creed with some of the brilliant results which have been obtained in that field. Yet this is by no means the case. The heterodox philosophy which unhappily prevails does nothing to help the onward march of science; and is only not hurtful because its influence is neutralized by the inconsistency of its professors. Like too many Christians they do not live according to their creed. It is only in their occasional excursions into the province of theology that they make any practical use of their philosophic views. Their scientific labours are happily conducted on sounder principles. In their researches and experiments they are guided by laws of thought which "materialism" knows not, and make free use of the subtle powers of informal influence, which their philosophy denies to the religious inquirer. It is not to materialism or to any other false system that the growth of science is due. It is rather to the unconscious use of the one true philosophy which finds its most appropriate expression in a very different school. To one who looks beneath the surface, the clouds of new theories cannot hide the real significance of scientific development. Let scientists teach materialism as they list; we need not go far for its refutation. Their own work bears witness in unmistakable fashion to the reality of those mental powers which they would fain eliminate. The advance of physical science is the "triumph of mind over matter."

The presence of the idealist philosophy may at length awaken these scientists to the incongruity of their position, and bring home to them the need of some firm philosophic basis for their scientific teaching. But there is really no occasion for constructing any new system. In the philosophy which the Church has inherited from the genius of

Greece, purifying and perfecting it by the hands of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, the much-needed support is ready to hand. At first the unfamiliar language in which the Catholic philosophy is conveyed may hide its merits from modern inquirers, and the force of ancient prejudice may not be easily overcome.¹ But once let that old philosophy be seen in its real colours, and its truth will be once more acknowledged.

It is, surely, a significant fact that the system which, for want of a better name may be called the scholastic philosophy, stands midway between the two conflicting theories of idealism and materialism. This is the natural position of that truth which must ultimately prevail. *παντὶ μέσῳ τὸ κράτος θεὸς ὥπασεν.*

This philosophy must not be identified with the terminology of the schools, excellent things in their way; these terms are but the outward raiment of an inward reality. Nor is the important distinction between "matter and form" by any means the chief characteristic of scholasticism. The root lies deeper. A theory of knowledge, based on experienced facts, seizing and expressing the true relations of the objective truth, and the thinking subject which receives it, steering thus with even keel between the whirlpool of idealism and the shallows of materialism: this is the philosophy of St. Thomas and the Catholic Church. While the founders of other systems build theory on theory, and only look at those facts which suit their purpose, the true philosopher starts from facts alone. He does but give an ordered expression to those truths which are borne in upon the mind of man as freely and as naturally as the light of heaven pours upon his sight, and the many voices of nature echo in his

¹The common notion that the scholastic philosophy was responsible for the imperfect state of physical science in the middle ages is nothing more than a time-honoured superstition. The real causes of the low state of mediæval physics must be sought elsewhere. "The chaos resulting from the break up of the Western Empire being reduced to order mainly by the action of the Christian Church, at a period when the early germs of natural science had withered under the influence of the barbarian invasions, considerations relating to the next world occupied all mental activity, not directly employed in ministering to the immediate and most pressing wants of this." (*Contemporary Evolution*, by Professor Mivart, chap. i.)

ears. He does not explain away one fact that he may exaggerate the importance of another. What warrant has he to trust the senses which tell him of the surrounding matter, and to pay no heed to the inward voice which speaks of higher truths, and leads him onwards and upwards to a world unseen? The dictates of conscience, the sense of right and duty, the perception of truths which change not, and cannot spring from the ever-changing material world, all these are facts as certain and unquestionable as anything that can be felt by the senses or tested in the laboratory. We have no more right to explain these away as mere functions of matter than we have to say that the brain itself and all other material things are the dream of the thinking subject and have no real existence. As Plato tells us, we must needs make use of our own selves.¹ Once question the trustworthiness of our own faculties, once go behind the evidence of sense and the judgment of the practical reason which tells us of first principles, and there is an end of all philosophy and all science of whatever kind.

Happily such a thorough and consistent scepticism is as impossible as it is unreasonable. The materialist who questions and explains away the higher faculties of man, accepts without qualms the evidence of the lower senses. While on the other hand the idealist who denies the objective reality of material nature does not extend his scepticism to the world of mind. Thus, both schools stand self-condemned. A "philosophy" which cannot be consistent cannot be true, and can have no part with science, which is the knowledge of truth.

When the present Holy Father put forth his memorable Constitution on the Scholastic Philosophy, he numbered among the benefits which would follow from a return to that old philosophy the progress of all the sciences—*incrementum omnium scientiarum*. It is easy for those who know little and understand less of the scholastic metaphysics to receive this statement with incredulity. But it is none the less true. It is that old philosophy alone which affords a firm

¹ ἀλλ' ἡμῖν ἀνάγκη (οἶμαι) χρῆσθαι ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς. Socrates in the *Theætetus*.

basis and support for true science of whatever kind; and the Church which cherishes that philosophy is the best friend of science and of reason. Those who are still disposed to doubt the compatibility of mediæval philosophy with modern science would do well to read the fourth chapter of Professor Mivart's *Contemporary Evolution*. It is, surely, a significant fact that some three years before the publication of the Encyclical *Æterni Patris*, the claims of scholasticism were ably and earnestly advocated by one of the most eminent of modern scientists.

Nor is it only in the formation of a just and ordered knowledge of the things of earth that reason finds its true office. It can pass beyond them to a real though imperfect knowledge of higher truths. This is not a claim newly put forth by rationalistic theologians. It is and ever has been the teaching of the Church. In the earliest ages we find Clement of Alexandria frankly recognising the high value of Greek philosophy in its bearing on the truths of religion; and his words are echoed by the Holy Father in our own day. The natural theology and ethics of the schoolmen were to a great extent taken from Aristotle. This might seem sufficient evidence of the fact that Catholic theologians considered some knowledge of those subjects within the range of natural reason. If a modern school has sought to narrow that range and deny to reason any power of acquiring such a knowledge of religious truth, this has only served to bring out more clearly than ever what the Church really teaches on this important point. The "traditionalist" theory was promptly repudiated by the voice of authority, and its chief advocates were required to acknowledge the truth that natural reason can obtain a knowledge of the existence of God. And in the Ecumenical Council¹ this teaching was solemnly defined. At the same time, Catholic theologians take care to insist on the fact that men are liable to error, and are, moreover, beset and hampered by so many difficulties and obstacles in searching out the truths of natural theology and ethics that their reason cannot,

¹ *Concil. Vatican, Constitutio de Fide Catholica*, cap. 2, and *Can. 1 de Revelatione*.

unaided, attain to a full knowledge of them. This statement is surely well warranted by the evidence of facts. Even the great philosophers of Greece, whose writings are an abiding proof of what reason can do, bear witness by their errors to its weakness and its need of support. In the brighter light afforded by revelation, ethics and natural theology are set forth with a completeness and a freedom from error which reason may recognise, but cannot reach of itself.

Here, it is of the utmost importance to keep in mind the distinction between the two orders of knowledge—the natural and the supernatural. As Scheeben has shown in his masterly treatise, *Natur und Gnade*, this is the real key to the position. Eliminate that distinction, and there will remain no *tertium quid* between rationalism and traditionalism. It will be impossible to maintain sufficiently the absolute need of revelation without denying to reason any native power of coming to a knowledge of God; or, on the other hand, to assert that power without dragging down from their impenetrable heights the hidden things of faith. The pronouncements of Holy Church on this matter seem involved in hopeless confusion, when once we lose sight of this fundamental distinction. The light of revelation scatters those clouds which else must darken the field of natural theology; and thus it renders valuable aid to reason in its own proper sphere. But it does far more than this. It opens up a region of truth, a world of heavenly and supernatural mysteries, which reason could neither find nor fathom. The existence of such mysteries is surely no difficulty; there is nothing here in conflict with the dictates of natural reason. True philosophy teaches us to know and to use our own powers; but at the same time it bids us recognise their limits. As Paschal truly says, “*La dernière démarche de la raison, c’est de connaître qu’il y a une infinité de choses qui la surpassent.*” There is much in the things at our feet which we can never fully understand: every new discovery which adds to our knowledge of nature is a fresh proof of the imperfection of that knowledge. Still more are we straitened when we turn to higher things, and seek to know God through the creatures He has made. How

faintly are His perfections shadowed forth in the best and purest of His works ! And the conceptions which we derive from these sources must needs be more imperfect still. He who doubts the existence of mysteries beyond and above his own powers, has surely made small progress in the knowledge within his reach.

In most false systems, whether of religion or of philosophy, there are some elements of truth. Nay, the error itself is often one half of a truth strained and exaggerated like a deformed limb. And this very exaggeration comes not unfrequently by way of reaction against an opposite error wherein this portion of the truth was lost sight of or openly denied. *Neglectum sui ulciscitur*. In the political world, tyranny naturally leads to revolution, and anarchy is the seed-time of despotism. So is it here. Every heresy or false philosophy gives birth to another of an opposite character. What the one denies the other exaggerates and overstates. Sabellianism and Arianism, Nestorianism and Eutychianism, Nominalism and extreme Realism, Rationalism and Agnosticism, are all so many instances of this genesis of error. There is much in the language of modern agnosticism which strangely resembles the orthodox doctrine on the necessary imperfection of our conceptions of the divine nature and attributes, and on the need of faith and of revelation. Indeed, we may say that this latest phase of modern thought is partly due to ignorance or misconception of the true doctrine on these questions, and partly to a reaction against the earlier forms of theological "rationalism." The hopeless teaching that we can know nothing, is the natural outcome of the arrogant claim to know all.

The heavenly mysteries of the faith are, indeed, outside the province of human philosophy and beyond the reach of our natural powers. They must be made known by divine revelation and accepted by supernatural faith. Nevertheless, even here, reason has a manifold and important office. And first, reason must go before and accompany that supernatural faith by which the teaching of revelation is received. As St. Augustine says, we could not believe unless we had

rational souls.¹ The habit or principle of faith presupposes a soul capable of receiving it; the act of faith requires not merely the faculty of reason but its exercise. The assent is, indeed, elicited by a supernatural power: but it must none the less be based on reasonable grounds. It must be, in the words of St. Paul, the "reasonable homage of faith." Reason tells us that in matters beyond our own knowledge we must needs be guided by authority. We have, indeed, to weigh the credibility of the writer, and consider his claim to speak with authority; but when the credentials are satisfactory, reason itself enjoins assent. It is the height of unreason to ask for direct proof of matter beyond our reach, and to reject the testimony of trustworthy witnesses. Our knowledge of distant places or of other times than our own must rest on the word of others. From the nature of the case we cannot go by *a priori* reasoning in these matters. Still more is this so with those eternal mysteries which transcend all place and time. Here we must be taught of God, or remain for ever in ignorance. A doctrine which makes no claim to divine origin stands thus self-condemned. But where the claim is advanced it is for reason to weigh well the evidence—not for the doctrine itself, for this is not susceptible of proof—but for the fact that the teaching does indeed come from God. In this inquiry we must not confine ourselves to any narrow formalism; we must be true to our nature and allow free play to all its powers. It is not a question of abstract theory, but a most momentous fact. And these concrete truths are often best known by means of informal inference and the exercise of what Cardinal Newman calls the illative sense. Truth is at times borne in upon us with a force that is not the less irresistible because we cannot well put it into words.

When once the motives of credibility have been duly weighed and found to be sufficient to warrant and induce assent, it is plainly unreasonable to question any part of the doctrine delivered to us. No incidental difficulty can justify

¹ Absit, inquam, ut ideo credamus ne rationem accipiamus sive quaeramus, cum etiam credere non possemus, nisi rationabiles animas haberemus. (Ep. 120, ad Crescentium.)

this. Certitude is indefectible; and one established fact must not be denied because we do not see how it fits in with another equally certain. Nature itself has many difficulties of this kind. And we might well expect to find them in a greater degree in the mysteries of revelation. Reason may, indeed, do something to lessen the difficulty. But the denial of any portion of revealed teaching can never have this effect. It is, after all, the substitution of a real contradiction for one that is imaginary. The rationalizing theologian who first accepts the teaching of revelation and then proceeds to reconstruct its doctrines according to his own light, is of all men the most unreasonable.

It would, however, be a great mistake to suppose that when reason has satisfied itself of the evidence for revelation, its task is done. On the contrary, a higher office still remains. What that is may be seen on every page of the Fathers and theologians. To enter as far as possible into the deep meaning of the truths delivered to us; to seize and set forth their harmony with one another and with natural truths, and to give to them an ordered arrangement and a scientific form—all this is the office of reason purified and elevated by the light of grace and supernatural faith.¹ We may truly say of grace, as the poet says of earthly love, that it

“ Gives to every power a double power
Above their functions and their offices.”

Even here the *rationabile obsequium* of faith has an abundant reward. A new world of truth and light is opened to us, and all the regions of our knowledge are lit up by its rays. The conceptions of philosophy are elevated and perfected in the light of supernatural theology.² And the natural sciences possessing to the full all their native charms, acquire fresh attractions for those who can recognise their harmony with higher truths, and see the hand of God in all His works.

Here let me close this faint and imperfect sketch of the office of reason in Catholic philosophy and theology. There

¹ Cf. *Concil. Vatican, Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide*, cap. iv.

² Cf. Scheeben, *Mysterien des Christenthums*, ss. 69.

is no need, surely, to labour the point and bring forward arguments to show that this is the true conception of the natural powers and duties of reason, or that the contrary teaching is false in itself and baneful in its results. It is really a question of apprehension rather than judgment. So long as the opposing systems are not seen in their true colours it is plainly of no use to offer arguments. And when once they are thus seen, proof is no longer needed.

W. H. KENT, O.S.C.

THE IRISH ABBEY IN YPRES.—II.

THE first superior of the Irish community, Abbess Cary, died on February 20th, 1686, and was succeeded by Dame Mary Joseph Butler, who belonged to the family of the Duke of Ormond. The See of Ypres being then vacant, the new abbess was blessed at Comines, on November 24th, by Mgr. de-Choiseul-de-Plessis-Praslin, Bishop of Tournay. In the following year King James II. ordered the Duke of Tyrconnell, his Lieutenant in Ireland, to write to Abbess Butler, asking her to repair to Dublin with the view of establishing her monastery in that city.¹ In more than one quarter great objections were raised to the proposal, but the perseverance of the king overcame them all, and the Lord Lieutenant took a house for the nuns in Great Ship-street, from which it appears they moved after a time to another in Channell-row, on the North of the Liffey, which afterwards belonged to the Dominican nuns who are now settled at Cabra. Abbess Butler travelled from Ypres in the habit of her order; and, still wearing it, waited on the Queen, Mary of Modena, at Whitehall, on her way through London. She reached Dublin on the 31st of October, 1689, and was presented to the king, who received her very graciously. James showed his interest in the new

¹ See *Gallia Christiana*, v. 348.

community by assisting at the consecration of the conventual church, a ceremony which was performed by Archbishop Patrick Russell of Dublin; and in a more marked manner in the following year by giving them a royal charter. The original of this is still in the archives of the Ypres Abbey, and it will be allowable perhaps to quote it in full :—

“James the II, by the grace of God, of England Scotland France and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, to all to whom these presents shall come greeting, know ye that we of our special grace, certain knowledge and meer motion have granted, constituted, ordained and declared, and appointed, and by these presents we do for us our heirs and successors, grant and constitute, ordain, declare, and appoint that there shall be from time to time and at all times hereafter in our city of Dublin, or in any other convenient place in our kingdom of Ireland a convent of nuns of the Order of St. Benedict, consisting of one abbess, and nuns, and to be called and known by the name of abbess and convent of our first and chief Royal Monastery of Gratia Dei, and we do for us, our heirs and successors ordain and declare by these presents that within the said convent there shall be one free body politique and cooperate, consisting of one abbess and nuns and that all the novices when professed shall be professed nuns of the Order of St. Benedict in the said Monastery of Gratia Dei, and shall be for ever hereafter by virtue of these presents one true body politique and cooperate in matters cause and name by the name of abbess and convent of our chief Royal Monastery of Gratia Dei and that they shall by the said name be one true free body politique and cooperate in matters cause and name to the full, and that they by the name of abbess and convent of our Royal Monastery of Gratia Dei may have perpetual succession and that they may be from time to time, and at all times hereafter persons capable in law to have receive and possess lands, tenements, and hereditments, goods, chattelles, and what kind soever to them and their successors, all sorts of fruits, oblations, legacies, lations, or grants, either from us, or from any other person or persons whatsoever and to build a monastery, and to have a house, a garden, in our said city of Dublin, or elsewhere within our said kingdom of Ireland, and that they by the name aforesaid may plead, and be impleaded, answer and be answered, defend and be defended, before us our heirs and successors, and before any of the judges of us our heirs and successors in all sorts of actions, plaints, and demands whatsoever against them or to be brought by them in this our kingdom of Ireland and we do of our like especial grace, certain knowledge and meer motion for us our heirs and successors give and constitute that the said abbess of the said convent and her

successors for ever shall be constituted, and chosen in such manner in these presents here expressed and specified and that for the better execution of the premises, and for the good rule and government of the said monastery from time to time for ever we have assigned, named, ordained, and constituted, and by these presents for us and heirs, and successors we do assign name, ordain, and constitute our well-beloved Dame Mary Butler, to be first abbess of the said convent of St. Benedict, willing that the said Mary Butler be, and shall continue abbess of the said convent, during her life, and if the said abbess shall happen to die or be removed for reasonable cause that then, and so often it shall, and may be lawful for the nuns of the said Order of St. Benedict to go to a new election of an abbess according to the Rules of St. Benedict, and also we have assigned, named, ordained, and constituted, and by these presents we for us our heirs and successors do assign, name, ordain and constitute our well-beloved Margaret and Mary Lawson, to be the first two nuns of the said Order of St. Benedict in the same monastery, to continue therein during their lives, if not removed for some reasonable cause, and further we do for us, our heirs and successors, grant that the said abbess, and convent shall have a common seal of the same form and impression as they shall think fit for the affairs of the said monastery, and that the said abbess, and convent and their successors for ever as often as they shall see occasion have power to choose, and receive, and profess novices, and other persons according to the rules and constitutions of St. Benedict aforesaid, and power to them to make such rules, and orders for the better government of the said monastery, and of the persons therein residing as they shall deem meet so as such rules and orders shall be sonant and agreeing to the rules of St. Benedict, and further our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby for us our heirs and successors for the better establishment and maintainment of the said abbess, and convent, and their successors give and grant unto them an annuity of one hundred pounds sterling to be paid to them, and their successors every year for ever out of the receipt of our Exchequer at two different times, viz., at Christmas and the feast of St. John Baptist half yearly by even, and equal moities, the first payment thereof to be at the feast of our Lord Jesus Christ next ensuing the date hereof, and we do further for us and our heirs and successors grant that the said abbess and convent shall enjoy all and singular the premises, without any taxes, exactions and subceed whatsoever, and further of our special grace, and certain knowledge, and meer motive we have given, granted, and by these presents do give and grant unto the said abbess, and convent, and their successors, for ever these our letters patents by the enrollment thereof shall be in all things, firm, good, and valid, sufficient and effectual in the law unto them the said abbess and convent,

and their successors, and shall be construed, and interpreted in as favorable benign and gracious manner and form as they may be as well in our court, and within our said realm of Ireland, or elsewhere to the best advantage, benefit and behalf of the said abbess and convent, notwithstanding the statute of mortmaine, and notwithstanding any other cause, matter, or thing to the contrary, privileged always that these our present patents shall be enrolled in the rolls of our high court of Chancery, in this our kingdom of Ireland, and in the space of six months next after the date of these presents although no express mention be made of the true yearly value, or of the premises or of any gift or grant heretofore made by us, or any of our progenitors to the said abbess or convent of the premises in these presents and statute and ordinance or possession or restitution or any other cause matter or thing and whatsoever to the contrary hereof in anywise notwithstanding in witness thereof we have caused these our letters to be made patents. Witness our Seal at Dublin the 5th June and 6th year of our reign.

“THOMAS ARTHUR.”

Less than a month after he had signed these letters patent the King of England Scotland and Ireland was defeated by his Dutch son-in-law at the battle of the Boyne, and then, despairing of maintaining his right, fled to France.

Immediately after her arrival in Ireland, Abbess Butler took possession of her convent, and introduced regular observance. She opened a school, and received into it the daughters of some of the chief Irish families. Out of thirty who were thus entrusted to her charge no less than eighteen asked for the Benedictine cowl; but the prudent abbess, fearing as she did the success of the revolution, would not accede to their demand, bidding them wait for more settled times. Her forebodings were only too well justified by the disastrous battle of the Boyne, after which Schomberg's troops marched on Dublin, and when there did not fail to ransack the monastery; but the abbess had fortunately sent her pupils home, and with her nuns taken refuge in a neighbouring house. She managed, too, to save her church plate. At this trying time her relative, the Duke of Ormond, sought her out, and promised that if she would stay in Ireland she should receive the protection of William; she insisted, however, on returning to Ypres, and Ormond procured her a safe conduct,

It was long before the abbey of Ypres recovered from this *contretemps*. The Pontoise nuns had returned to their own convent, and for five long years the brave abbess struggled on in the greatest poverty with only four lay sisters to form her community; among her benefactors in this time of bitter trial must be mentioned His Holiness Innocent XII., who in 1699 gave the nuns the sum of one thousand scudi, being part of a large sum set aside by him for the relief of the distressed Irish refugees; ¹ a sum of five hundred florins allowed them annually by the King of France; and an allowance from the Queen of England, Mary of Modena, as we learn from the Caryll papers in the British Museum.²

The first of the Caryll papers relating to Ypres is a letter written by the abbess Caryll of Dunkirk to her brother John, afterwards Lord Caryll of West Grinstead in Sussex, secretary to the Queen of England, who was then in exile at St. Germain. The letter is undated, but was evidently written before December, 1699; and from it we can glean various interesting items. The first part relates to family affairs, and the last to those of the convent of Dunkirk; that portion which refers to Ypres is as follows:—

“ . . . Our Bishop and L'Abeye de Guie is now at Paris, an on of them if not both will be speedily at St. Germain, they appear to be very uneasy that they could not yett comply with the Queen's desire of Professing the four novises at Ipres, to serve her Ma^{ty} the Bishop seems sollisitous, yet the feare of bringing a burthen on the Dioces oblidges him to be cautious, the truth is they are very ill situated, and has bine these thirty years in this unsettled way; if the Queen should dye (whom God preserve) theyr maintenances ceases, however my Lord to shew his zeal in her Ma^{ty}s pious concurrence and independent of any casuality, he will try whether the 500 ^{as} the King of France gives as an almes during his life, may be a settled foundation. I have used all my weak endeavours to further it, and have promist too of my Religious to assist the Lady Butler till her novices be fitted and experienced in Religious Discipline.”

The bishop failed to get a settled foundation from Louis XIV., and to avoid the Queen's importunities did not go to

¹ See *Sketch of the Persecutions suffered by the Catholics of Ireland* (page 647) by his Eminence Cardinal Moran, Abp. of Sydney. Dublin, 1884.

² *Add MSS.* 28,226.

St. Germain's, as we learn from another letter from the abbess to her brother :—

“ . . . Now I can tell you what has made my Lord Bishop change his resolutions of going to St. Germain's, was only to avoid the Queen's solicitations to profess the novices ; had he succeeded in his proposals of getting a settled foundation from France, he would have prevented the Queen, in offering her Mag^y to receive their vows, but failing of this project he would not make his appearance, however, the Abbot de Guie is resolved to give that mark of respect to the Queen. . . . ”

Having failed to get an endowment from the King of France the bishop seems to have cast about for some other solution of the difficulty. Unwilling as he was to burden his diocese with the maintenance of a religious house, he was no less unwilling to refuse to profess the four novices in whom the Queen of England took so great an interest. He accordingly proposed to incorporate the convent of Ypres with that of Dunkirk. This idea, however, met with but little favour at Dunkirk, as may be seen from the following letter, dated Dec. 2nd, 1699 :—

“ MY DEAR BROTHER,

“ . . . I am bound to say much more to you from this family and myself, for the evil you have averted had we been so unfortunate as to have been incorporated with these good people at Ypres, what would become of us if we had not so beneficial a friend as you at Court, his holy name be praised for it, the same goodness reward you with health and long life, which is the daily prayer of this community, in the meantime I am amused that such a proposal should be entertained in the thought of an indolent person ; how ever I will give you another proposal in their behalfs, the Queen maintains too Religious that was Profest in Ireland, what if the Queen proposed to our Bishop, their removal to this Monastery of Ypres ? If you allow of this project speak of it to her Ma^{ty} give at the same time our most humble duties and profound respects perhaps their will still be the same objection, no certainty of a foundation to be depended on how ever we be so frightened and alarmed at this project, that I shall hardly venture any of my Religious to bring up their young ones, as I have consented too, by that lady Butler's importunity's, but now shall take leave of having any more to do, with thanks to God that I have escaped by your favour. . . . I am with all the gratitude imaginable, Dear Brother,

“ Your affectionate Sister,

“ MA. CARYLL,”

It is much to be wished that the good abbess had mentioned where the two religious professed in Ireland were, and why they were not at Ypres. The community of Dunkirk delegated one of their number, Dame Maura Knightley, to write a formal letter of thanks to Mr. Caryll for the service he had done them in preventing the incorporation "which had ellse beene inevitable;" but she seems to have thought that they were not quite safe, for she continues:—"The whole community does most earnestly beseech y^r Hon^r still to enterpose your credit to secure us in a business My L^d Bishop thinks he must bring about to satisfy the Queen, and yett not charge his own Bishoprick by proffessing the four Irish novices in the unsettled condition of that house, w^{ch} both himself, and the towne soe long intended to dissolve."

It says not a little for the unconquerable perseverance of Abbess Butler that she should have struggled through such difficulties; but she had a good friend in the Queen and in the end won the day, so that not only were her novices professed and her house not dissolved, but it is actually the only one of the communities then existing in Ypres which has remained to this day. When the bishop yielded to the importunate demands of Queen Mary, and consented to admit the novices to profession, another difficulty arose—there were no funds to put the church into proper order. But the energy of the little community overcame this, and it is recorded that one, at least, of the novices, Sister Xaveria Arthur, of whom more anon, carried earth in baskets from the garden through the street into the church to prepare a bed for the pavement which in due course was laid. This was in 1700.

In the following year King James II. died in exile. He had been a true friend to the Irish nuns; and the present community possesses many letters written by him to their predecessors. They possess too a quantity of lace which was made by the unfortunate Queen of Scots, and given to the convent by her hardly less unfortunate successor. It is impossible to doubt that the good abbess must have been intensely Jacobite in her feelings, and that therefore she

must have been given considerable pleasure in her old age by the adhesion of her kinsman the Duke of Ormond, who had befriended her in Dublin, to the son of her benefactor; even though it brought about, as it did in 1715, the Duke's impeachment, attainder, and exile.

Five years after the death of James, in 1706, the battle of Ramillies took place. An Irish regiment commanded by Lord Clare took part in it, fighting under the French colours. Out of a total of eight hundred men no less than three hundred and sixty-four, of whom thirty-eight were officers, were killed. Lord Clare himself received a mortal wound, and died soon after at Brussels. On that occasion the British troops lost two colours, and the honour of taking them fell to Clare's regiment; the lieutenant-colonel of which, Murrough O'Brien, placed them in the church of the Irish Abbey at Ypres,¹ an incident which is referred to by the poet Davis:—

“ The flags we conquered in that fray
Look lone in Ypres choir they say.”

Abbess Butler died in 1723; in the eighty-second year of her age, the sixty-fifth of her religious profession, and the thirty-eighth of her reign as abbess. To her prudence and perseverance are due the existence of the Irish abbey of Ypres; and, indeed, when those five long years, with no one in her community but four lay sisters, are remembered, it would hardly be too much to speak of her as the real foundress of the house. Many another would have given up in despair after the Dublin disaster, and have retired to the quiet of some other convent of her Order. But she stuck to her post, and after a long time of waiting, gathered together a small band of novices, with whom, as soon as it was possible, she recommenced the choral recitation of the Divine Office. This was in 1700, and from that time to this it has gone on regularly in spite of the troubles brought about by the French Revolution, which will be dealt with in another number of the I. E. RECORD.

E. W. BECK.

¹ See *History of the Irish Brigades in the Service of France*, by John Cornelius O'Callaghan. 1885.

THOUGHTS ABOUT ST. PATRICK:

ST. PATRICK AND ST. PAUL.

THERE is a strong and growing feeling that there are already too many theories about the life and labours of Ireland's national saint. It may be well, therefore, to say at the outset, that the title of this paper—which may, at first view, appear somewhat startling—does not imply that yet another is to be added to the number. Many are beginning to think that recent Patrician literature has concerned itself too much about a few controverted points in the life of our saint; and too little, very much too little, about that beautiful life itself. They think that much of the theorizing on the subject might have been omitted without detriment either to the cause of historical truth or to the honour of the saint himself; and, however ingenious or original or brilliant it may appear, they are sometimes at a loss to understand either the ground on which it rests or the good purpose it could possibly serve. In a word, there are in the saint's life, a few points which have hitherto been subjects of controversy and doubt; with present materials they are likely, or certain, to remain so; and it is the opinion of those to whom I refer, that it is wiser—even were it not so necessary as it is—candidly to acknowledge as much. And this for many reasons. Such authorities as O'Curry assure us that the materials of Irish history, to be yet written, are all but unlimited. His own researches in the field of Irish archæology were rewarded by many valuable discoveries. *The Tripartite Life*, one of the seven in Colgan's *Trias Thaumaturga*, and perhaps the most prized of all the ancient lives of St. Patrick, was long lost, and was discovered only in comparatively recent times. Is it too much to hope for other and yet greater discoveries still in the same field? or, may not future research decide once and for all some or all of those questions we now discuss so warmly, and upset many a theory that had cost its author much precious labour and time?¹

¹The above was written before we had seen the learned paper of Fr. Malone, to which, therefore, it need scarcely be said, there is no special

Whatever of this, we repeat that, *with present materials*, there are some few questions that are not likely to be solved. About the exact year of his birth, for instance, we have no less than five opinions, resting each on respectable authority. What avails it to continue the discussion, unless for the privilege or pleasure of differing from such writers as Colgan and Lanigan, Villaneuva, Jocelyn, and Tillemont. Nor does the question of place appear nearer to solution. The weight of authority seemed in favour of France; but the balance is, perhaps, on a level since Cardinal Moran decided in favour of Scotland. And when we come to localities, there are nearly a score that claim the honour.

Again, why should it appear a matter of surprise or importance if we must leave a few such questions unanswered? A very long list, we think, might easily be made out of names the greatest in history, sacred and profane, about which similar doubts exist; nor would St. Patrick be the only national apostle in the list. Not to go further, is it settled where St. Augustine, England's apostle, was born? Indeed, it is wonderful how little we do know sometimes of even the greatest names. Someone has undertaken to put into one sentence—and it does not err in length—all that is known for certain of the greatest dramatist that ever lived; and when it comes to the question of writing or pronouncing his name—an elementary one, as would appear—the learned cannot agree. In future time there may be similar doubt about the very name of the arch-heresiarch of latter times, for the very good reason that he seems to have changed it as often as his doctrines, and to have written it himself in no less than four or five different ways. What wonder if, in the case of a saint who lived fourteen hundred years ago, we cannot determine the place of his consecration or the exact year of his birth?

And, if another reason of the same kind may be added, what we *do* know for certain is very much, very edifying, and worthy of our deepest attention and study. It is found in his own authentic writings. Few as they are—and this

reference. How far he has made good the claim of Wales as the birth-place of St. Patrick, we must leave to others to decide.

is one of the strange things about him—they nevertheless tell us more of his inner self than what we know of saints who wrote at much greater length.

It is a picture unique in the history of God's Church ; a beautiful picture from whatever standpoint we look at it. A great soul prepared by God for the highest mission by fitting graces and rarest gifts ; labouring with a zeal, and rewarded with a success, the like of which the world had seldom, if ever, seen equalled ! Even from another and lower standpoint there is much to study and admire in the story of his life : scenes varying from the tenderest pathos to the highest drama. No wonder that such a life, with the countless legends of pathos and beauty that circle around it, should have attracted the fancy of one of Ireland's truest poets, or that the genius of Aubrey de Vere should have weaved out of such a theme a work¹ which of itself should place his name very high among the greatest of English poets.

With those who make the lives of God's saints a study, nothing is more common—as we must have observed—than comparison and contrast. All have much in common ; there is, as some one has said, a family likeness between them all ; but yet a beautiful study it must be to inquire how, like star differing from star in glory, saint differs from saint in some special grace or gift that is all his own. As an example of such study, we would have quoted, did space permit, a beautiful passage in which, writing of his own St. Philip, one of his greatest sons,² compares him to other saints of his time, and in a few words, worthy of so great a master of language, pointing out what he had in common with each, as well as what distinguished him from all.

But why, it may be asked, do we go back, in order to find a prototype for our saint, to the Prophets and Apostles ? The answer is, the comparison is not ours. It has been made and repeated by the biographers of St. Patrick, from St. Evin, who lived in an age so close on the saint's own, down to Fr. Morris and Dean Kinnane. It occurred to us that there must be good reason for a comparison thus

¹ *Legends of St. Patrick.*

² Newman, *Idea of a University*, page 235.

frequently and authoritatively suggested, and that it would be an interesting study to seek out what the reasons were. This is the aim of the present paper: the study must be flattering to us as children of St. Patrick; it may be edifying; it certainly has the negative merit—which some recent theories can hardly claim—that it can do no harm; and if the tendency, if not the effect, of some of those latter was to make people begin to doubt of the very existence of a saint, every event of whose life was the subject of endless controversy, it will have a counteracting effect, if we so far take that life and all its main events as certain, as to compare him to so great a saint, and one of so decided a personality, as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

We have said that St. Patrick's biographers generally compare him to St. Paul: one or two examples will suffice:—

“A just man, indeed, was this man: with purity of nature, like the patriarchs; a true pilgrim, like Abraham; gentle and forgiving, like Moses; a praiseworthy psalmist, like David; an emulator of wisdom, like Solomon; a chosen vessel for proclaiming truth, *like the Apostle Paul*; a man full of grace and the knowledge of the Holy Ghost, like the beloved John; a fair flower-garden to children of grace, a fruitful vine-branch . . . a lion in strength and power, a dove in gentleness and humility, a serpent in wisdom and cunning to do good; gentle, humble, merciful to the sons of life; dark, ungentle towards the sons of death; a servant of labour and service of Christ; a king in dignity and power for binding and loosening, for liberating and convicting, for killing and giving life.”¹

And in the hymn of St. Sechnall or Secundinus, nephew of our saint, we find:—

“*Quem Deus misit ut Paulum
Ad gentes apostolum
Ut hominibus ducatum
Proeberet regno Dei.*”²

With most of the comparisons in these passages we are not concerned now. To some of the prophets St. Patrick bore an evident resemblance—notably to Moses, to whom he is often likened in the olden lives; but this we must leave to another time, if not to another pen. Moses on the

¹ *Tripartite Life.*

² *Liber Hymnorum*, 1885.

mount with God, and Patrick struggling on Cruachan; Moses before Pharaoh, and our saint before Laeghaire, whose heart was hardened like that of Pharaoh;¹ Moses leading the Israelites through the desert, and Patrick, on his return from captivity, obtaining food miraculously for his followers in the wilderness—are pictures which we need only place side by side; and they are only some of the points of striking, and we might almost say mysterious, resemblance between the two. The grandeur of his miracles, his familiarity with heaven, his constant intercourse with and guidance by his angel Victor, remind us rather of a theocracy than the *magisterium* of the Church, and suggest comparison with the saints of the Old rather than of the New Law.

The name of St. Paul is specially mentioned in both of the passages quoted, and it is with it alone we will now concern ourselves. The saints of God are distinguished one from another chiefly in this, that each seems to have what may be called a characteristic gift, a peculiar grace, a spirit which may be called his own. If, therefore, we would compare or contrast one with another, our first thought must be about the distinguishing grace of each. What was the distinguishing gift of St. Paul? Fortunately we get an answer from the distinguished writer already referred to:² he treats of this very subject in two places:—

“And I think his characteristic gift is this—that, as I have said, in him the fulness of divine gifts does not tend to destroy what is human in him, but to spiritualize and perfect it. According to his own words, used on another subject, but laying down, as it were, the principle on which his own character was formed—‘We would not be *unclothed* [he says], but clothed *upon*; that what is mortal may be swallowed up in life.’”

And again, in the sermon, “St. Paul’s Characteristic Gifts,” he says:—

“To him specially was it given to preach to the world who knew the world; he subdued the heart who understood the heart. It was his *sympathy* that was his means of influence; it was his affectionateness that was his title of empire.”

Readers of the life of St. Patrick need not be told that

¹ *Vita Sexta Jocelyn.*

² Newman, *Sermons on Various Occasions.*

all this applies to him as literally as to his great prototype. Human sympathy, elevated by grace and spiritualized till it became a most burning zeal for souls, was also a characteristic of his. It is remarkable that of two of his most recent biographers¹ one heads a chapter "St. Patrick's tenderness of heart," and another "St. Patrick's zeal for souls." Aubrey de Vere, in describing the saint addressing some chieftain and his court, thus beautifully touches the same trait in the conclusion of his description :—

. . . "Gradual thus
With lessening cadence sank that great discourse,
While round him gazed Saint Patrick, now the old
Regarding, now the young ; and flung on each
In turn his *boundless* heart, and gazing *longed*,
As only apostolic heart can long,
To help the helpless."²

But the best evidence of this spirit of our saint is found in his *Epistle to Coroticus*, every line of which breathes the tenderest sympathy and the most ardent zeal for the souls of his people. Some of these had been carried away captive by the Welsh marauder ; from his hands they are likely to pass as slaves to the Picts and Scots ; and the saint after a first expostulation in vain sends a letter to Coroticus himself. The tender pathos, when he speaks of his captive children, reminds us of the Epistle to Titus or Timothy or the beloved Philippians ; while the fierce denunciation of the tyrant himself vies with anything to be found in the Epistles to the Corinthians. Outside the parable of the Good Shepherd it would be hard to find a finer picture of what the good shepherd should be :—

"What shall I do, O Lord ? . . . Lo ! Thy children are torn round me and plundered . . . Ravening wolves have scattered the flock of the Lord . . . Therefore I cry out with grief and sorrow : O beautiful and well-beloved brethren, whom I have brought forth in Christ in such multitudes, what shall I do for you ? I grieve, O my beloved ones . . . I have abandoned my country and parents, and would give my soul unto death, if I were worthy."³

¹ Fr. Morris and Dean Kinnane.

² *Legends of St. Patrick.*

³ *Letter to Co. oticus.*

Perhaps the virtue, after zeal and charity, that is most conspicuous in the two saints is humility. It may be said to be a characteristic of both, and both express it—and they are constantly giving expression to it—in language very similar. If St. Paul is the “last of the Apostles,” a “persecutor of the Church,” “carnal,” and “sold under sin,” St. Patrick is “a sinner,” and “the unlearned,” “the rudest and least of all the faithful,” and was brought “captive to Ireland, as we deserved, for we had forsaken God.”

If the spirit of the two saints be so similar, if their characteristic gifts be identical, we should expect that the resemblance should show itself (2) in the *style* of their writings and (3) in the *method* of their missionary labours. And so, we think, it is. Like everything about St. Patrick, his style is marked by a strong distinctive personality; so much so, indeed, that some one has said it is inimitable. It is, according to an ancient writer, its own witness; yet we are constantly met with passages in both the *Confession* and *Epistle* which remind us of St. Paul's Epistles, in phrase and style, as well as in sentiment. True, an explanation may be found in St. Patrick's thorough acquaintance with Sacred Scripture. That he studied in the most famous centres of learning and sanctity, and that Sacred Scripture formed part of his course, are equally certain. *The Tripartite* mentions his visit to St. Martin at Marmonties; Probus assures us that he spent many years with St. Germanus at Auxerré; and another writer assures us that he studied Scripture at Rome. Wherever he studied it, there can be no doubt of his remarkable familiarity with it; his frequent quotations, and still more his constant allusions, bear ample testimony to a knowlege of every part of Scripture that was simply wonderful. This may explain any similarity in style, as well as in ideas, of the kind referred to; but we think it would be as satisfactory and, perhaps, more reasonable to say that, as the two great souls were similarly gifted by God, so, when they came to speak, their thoughts clothed themselves in like words and phrases.

The same principle would explain the similarity that is said to exist between passages of the *Lorica* and St. Francis'

Hymn to the Sun; for among more modern saints there is none to whom our national apostle can be better likened than the seraphic Francis; a fact which—we may say in passing—may go some way to account for the mutual attachment and devotion of their children to this day. Without making any attempt at collating, which would be unnecessary for those who are familiar with St. Paul's style, it will be sufficient to quote one or two passages from writings with which we are, perhaps, less familiar. Does not the following remind us of a conclusion of some of St. Paul's Epistles?—

“In that day we shall arise in the brightness of the sun, that is, in the glory of Jesus Christ, and all redeemed we shall be, as it were, the sons of God, and co-heirs of Christ, and made like to His image in the future. For from Him, and in Him, and by Him are all things; to Him be glory for ever. Amen.”¹

In another part of the same we find—and it shall be our last quotation:—

“And on another night, whether in me or near me, God knows, I heard eloquent words, which I could not understand until the end of the speech, when it was said: ‘He who gave His life for thee is He who speaks in thee,’ and so I awoke full of joy. And, again, I saw one praying within me; and I was as it were within my body, and I heard, that is, above the inner man, and there he prayed earnestly with groans . . . and I awoke, and remembered that the Apostle said: ‘Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity.’” (Rom. viii. 26.)

In fine, a word on the *method* of their labours. Both became all things to all men, and in a very special manner. The method of St. Patrick was not that of sweeping change or general revolution: the very opposite is particularly noted. He adapted and perfected rather than rejected. The laws he found before him he sought to purify, rejecting only what may not be retained. Witness his taking part in the compilation of the *Senchus Mor* in A.D. 439:—

“I to that people all things made myself,
For Christ's sake, building still that good they lacked,
On good already theirs.”²

¹ St. Patrick's *Confession*.

² *Legends of St. Patrick*, Aubrey de Vere

Even whatever knowledge of art and handicraft he found he carefully used for the glory of God, and the purposes of his mission. The same author, in a poem entitled *St. Patrick's Journey to Armagh*, describes his usual following; and, after mentioning Benignus his psalmist, Lecknall bishop, Erc his brehon, Mochta his priest, he adds:—

“ . . . And Sinnell of the bells,
Rodan his shepherd, Essa, Bite, and Tassach,
Workers of might, in iron and in stone,
God taught to build the churches of the faith
With wisdom, and with heart-delighting craft.”

How like is all this to the spirit and method of him who became all things to all men, and who while he was “the special preacher of divine grace is also the special friend and intimate of human nature,” who would circumcise the beloved Timothy to please the Jews, and who would himself conform to the rite of the Nazarites for the same purpose!

Again, it is pointed out by writers on St. Patrick—and, indeed, we cannot fail to remark it—that he, as if instinctively, first sought the enemy in his “centre and citadel” Royal Tara, Ailech of the Kings, Cruachan, and Cashel; such seemed to be the goals to which he would first direct his steps; and if he turned aside at all it was to seek out the stronghold of another and more powerful enemy, that of idolatry; for one of his first visits was to *Magh Slecht* to destroy the great idol *Crom Cruach*. In like manner do we find his great prototype in the great centres not of a nation only, but of the world—in Athens and Corinth, in Jerusalem and Rome. St. Patrick, boldly preaching the Gospel before council of king and brehon and druid, seems but a counterpart of St. Paul, proclaiming the name of Christ to the Jews in their synagogues, and to Gentiles in the very Areopagus.

There are many other points of resemblance of a minor kind, which we can only mention in a few words. Their mission was the same: St. Paul preached to the Gentiles; St. Patrick to “a barbarous nation.” In both cases there was a vocation direct from heaven; its manner was like in

each case, for the description of the scene in which St. Patrick heard a voice he knew not whether "within him or close by," and in which "fell scales from mine inner eyes," remind us, surely, of the great event that happened on the way to Damascus. St. Paul only knew Christ and Him crucified; St. Patrick—Tillemont tells us—was learned only in Scripture and sacred science. Both stand out unlike to, and distinct from, all around them, by a strong and peculiar personal character. In fine, when we hear of "the unearthly elevation" of his (St. Patrick's) character; that his character had a decided, though human share in his work; that he "subdued rather than persuaded," and that the "peculiar character of his apostolate came from the conviction of a special message from God," we cannot but feel that all this applies equally to the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

We have stated that the comparison we have been thus far considering is suggested by all the biographers of our saint. The beautiful life by our distinguished countryman, Aubrey de Vere—for, indeed, his series of poems may be said to be a life—is no exception; and, as we have quoted from him so often, we may fitly conclude by a passage in which he refers to it:—

" . . . The words that Patrick spake
Were words of power. Not futile did they fall;
But, probing, healed a sorrowing people's wound.
Round him they stood, as oft in Grecian days
Some haughty city sieged, her penitent sons
Thronging green Pnyx or templed Forum hushed,
Stood listening to that people's one true voice,
The man that ne'er had flattered, ne'er deceived,
Nursed no false hope."

JAMES HALPIN, C.C.

WALTER SCOTT'S JOURNAL.

FEW men have been more fortunate than Sir Walter Scott was in his biographer. As is well known, Lockhart's *Life of Scott* is a model of all that a full and detailed account of the career of a distinguished man should be. The general reader may, no doubt, find the perusal of the whole ten volumes, full of interest as they are, an over lengthy process. Should he do so, Lockhart himself furnishes him with an abridgement of the original; and this has again been epitomized by Mr. Jenkinson into an easy and short volume. Hence, the busiest man who is desirous of knowing somewhat of an author whose works have bewitched and delighted the three generations past of English-speaking peoples, can thus easily gratify his wish.

For the last six years of Scott's life, Lockhart found ample material in the volumes now before us—Sir Walter's own *Journal*. This, however, in its entirety, has only lately been given to the public by Mrs. Maxwell-Scott, Sir Walter's great-grand-daughter; a certain delay, for obvious reasons, being desirable before Scott's frank and unrestrained criticisms of events and persons should be made public. That his genial remarks could often have caused any serious heart-burnings, we doubt; still, near relations are sensitive; and Scott's representatives have acted wisely in retarding a publication any word of which might have jarred on those whose feelings Sir Walter would have been the first to respect.

The *Journal* now comes as a welcome reviver of our interest in the biography, which, we will preface our remarks on the former by observing, had best be glanced at afresh before reading the *Journal*. And this, although the editor has freely used Lockhart's work in footnotes, explaining much that without some such help would be obscure. Scott, not unnaturally, "as he talked to himself," did not think it necessary to be as explicit as the reader, more than half a

¹ *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott, from the Original Manuscript at Abbotsford. Two Volumes. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1890,*

century later, might wish ; and we therefore must look elsewhere for a fuller account of many a reference which Scott took for granted that his readers would understand.

The record of the last six years of Scott's life is contained in two large volumes, and so fascinating have we found them that we can only share his own regret that he did not earlier in life keep a Journal. As it is, Sir Walter is fifty-five years of age, and already a famous man, before he places on record his own impressions, and details the events of his daily life. Our regret is increased by the fact that it is only for a few months after his first entry that we read of the prosperous author and highly fortunate man. He begins to write in October ; and in the following January, through no fault of his own, but as a result of commercial failures in which he was involved, he is a ruined man, and is only saved from absolute bankruptcy by the forbearance of his creditors, to whom, in return, he pledges the profits of all future labour. Moreover, domestic sorrows follow hard on pecuniary losses ; and his well-loved wife, the companion of thirty years, whose health was already feeble when the monetary misfortunes befell her husband, succumbs ; and in the following May her loss is added to Scott's other trial. No wonder that for a moment his accustomed courage fails him, and he writes sadly :—

“ I think my heart will break. Lonely, aged . . . an impoverished and embarrassed man, I am deprived of the sharer of my thoughts and counsels, who could always talk down my sense of the calamitous apprehensions which break the heart that must bear them alone.”

It is not often, however, that Scott allows his own deep sorrow to sadden the pages of his journal. In the main, it is a book the reading of which is both bracing and profitable. So brave and courageous is the fight which Scott makes against accumulating misfortunes of pecuniary and domestic losses, which are speedily followed by weakened health and bodily suffering, and a lessening and clouding of his mental powers, that his cheerfulness throughout his trials is noteworthy ; and the energy with which he applies himself to remedy the misfortunes which he can, to some extent,

mitigate by his extraordinary industry and power of work, is beyond all praise.

Although it is difficult to fix on any one page or entry in the *Journal* as distinctive of Scott, yet the whole book enables us to form a tolerably accurate picture of the man. He is one whose intimate acquaintance, or still more, his real friendship, would have been valued by all. We see a thoroughly upright and strictly honourable man, an attached husband and affectionate father, a genial friend and a considerate master. In whatever relation of life Scott appears we should have been glad to have encountered him. Even his dogs were fortunate in their owner, and, as was once truly remarked, "Sir Walter was always a gentleman, even to his dogs." Then, as a companion, Scott must have been specially delightful. From his earliest youth he was an amusing and persistent story-teller; and his memory, though he himself tells us that it was rather a fickle ally, and often failed him when it came to names and dates, and the technicalities of history, yet retained tenaciously "passages of poetry, play-house ditties, or, above all, a border-raid ballad," and any amusing anecdotes that were likely to enhance his value as an entertaining companion. He was, moreover, pre-eminently a social being, who felt kindly towards his fellow-men, and who, even if he sometimes grumbled at the inroads on his time made by visitors, yet, we feel convinced, never suffered from the morose spirit which induces some men of genius to shun their kind. His love of nature, specially his own wild, stern Scotch nature, is evident. He once told Washington Irving that he could hardly survive a complete severance from the heathery moors of his native country; and his enjoyment of fishing, forestry, and all out-of-door pleasures is constantly appearing.

When the *Journal* opens, Scott's life had for many years run in the same grooves in which it remained until within a year or so of his death. Abbotsford was already built, and its woods were planted; and, as we hear of no more land being bought, we conclude that the estate was then of the size which it has since maintained. Indeed, we read in the *Journal* of a resolution Sir Walter makes on first hearing

the distant threatenings of the storm, which eventually engulfed his fortune, to the effect that no additional land must be purchased until his position is more secure. As, instead of any improvement, absolute ruin followed closely on his resolve, he must perforce have adhered to his intention. His life was spent between Abbotsford and Edinburgh; his residence for a certain number of months in the year in this city being necessitated by his legal position as a Clerk of Sessions. This appointment obliged Scott to spend some five or six hours in court on the days when the judges sat. It also involved a certain amount of legal work, such as studying references and authorities, when not actually present in the court-house. The labour was, therefore, sufficient to occupy an ordinary man's working hours, and to give him full employment. To Scott, however, his official duties were a mere interlude in his day. The greater part of his time was devoted to writing, his literary work being considerably more than we believe had ever before been accomplished by one man, and we will venture to add, has been accomplished since.

As is well known, the rapidity with which the *Waverley Novels* were written and published was almost phenomenal; and they were far from being Scott's sole literary work. In his earlier years he had achieved great political success, and to the end was engaged in writing history. Though not agreeing with Macaulay, when he tells us, that the most remarkable thing about the *Waverley Novels* was the rapidity with which they were written, and the large sums of money which Scott received for them; yet, no doubt, both are sufficiently noteworthy. Indeed, it may strike the reader of Scott's *Journal* that he appears to be writing only for gain. He must, however, remember that it is not for his own profit that Scott appears so anxious, but in order to realize the large sum of money necessary to satisfy his creditors.

When the failure of his printers and publishers, Constable and Ballantyne, ruined Scott, he found himself liable for the sum of £130,000. To meet this, he had but his own pen to rely on. He might, it is true, have allowed himself to be declared bankrupt, and have paid so many shillings in the

pound, sacrificing his household possessions and the property in his books already written to his creditors, though Abbotsford itself was beyond their reach, having been already settled on his eldest son. Had he done this, the future would have been all his own, and the profits from any works he might yet write he would himself have enjoyed. As it was, he preferred to make an exceptional arrangement with his creditors, and one which redounded greatly to the credit, moderation, and foresight of both parties. Sir Walter was allowed to remain unmolested in his own house, with his own library and furniture around him; and he, in his turn, guaranteed the ultimate payment of his debts in full. His confidence in his power of writing and of retaining his hold on the public taste may seem to have been excessive, but it was shared by his creditors, and in the end was justified. Neither side had miscalculated. The creditors knew well they were dealing with a gentleman, and an essentially honest man, who would do his uttermost to serve them; and although Scott paid the penalty of health, and probably shortened his life by his incessant labours, we feel sure that he thought it cheaply purchased at the price of allowing none eventually to be the poorer through his losses.

The *Journal* gives full evidence of the hardness of the task which stood before Scott. Some years earlier he wrote that the only difference between the labour of a rich man and of a poor one is, that the former works in order to get an appetite for his dinner, the latter works in order to get a dinner for his appetite. But it was for more than a dinner that Scott wrote. Throughout his efforts, however, cheerfulness never flags. Even at the actual time of his trial, his most serious complaint is the half playful quotation of a Spanish proverb which occurs to him after a sleepless night: "He that sleeps too long in the morning, let him borrow the pillow of a debtor." But, even in these early days, he consoles himself by reflecting that though the public favour is his only lottery, yet

"I have long enjoyed the foremost prize, and something in my breast tells me my evil genius will not overwhelm me if I stand by myself. Why should I not? I have no enemies—many

attached friends. The popular ascendancy which I have maintained is of the kind which is rather improved by frequent appearances."

And he turns at once to the writing of *Woodstock*, the novel which he had on hand when the disastrous failure of January, 1826, occurred.

How quickly and resolutely Scott sets to work, we may judge from the fact, that between the 19th January and the 2nd February he has written a volume; and a volume, at the cheapest, is to him worth £1,000! "This is working at the rate of £24,000 a year; but then" he prudently adds, "we must not bake buns faster than people have appetite to eat them. They are not essential to the market, like potatoes." It was not, too, alone on novels that Scott was busy. He had already commenced a voluminous *Life of Napoleon*, and the work was carried on at the same time as the novels and the series of easy books on history, known as *Tales of a Grandfather*, which Sir Walter wrote for his favourite little grandson, John Hugh Lockhart.

In order to obtain information on the spot for his *Life of Napoleon*, in the autumn following his pecuniary losses and the death of his wife, Scott visits both London and Paris. Scott was accompanied by his daughter, Anne, the only one of his four children, who was now his constant companion. After some four or five days' travelling by road, they reached London, where a warm welcome from old friends assured Sir Walter that his misfortune had in no way lessened their affection. This, indeed, had been marked from the first; and no sooner were Scott's losses made public, than he was almost overwhelmed by liberal offers of assistance: "all anxious to serve me, and careless about their own risk of loss." The same kindness now meets him in London; and no sooner had he arrived in Pall Mall, than he receives the royal commands to visit George IV. at Windsor. The king had always treated Scott with attention, and now received him in a gracious and flattering manner, made him sit at his side, and encouraged him to talk a great deal: "Too much, perhaps," said Sir Walter, "for the king has the art of raising one's spirits, and making you forget

the *retenue* which is prudent everywhere, especially at Court." No doubt George IV., like other men in his position, was glad occasionally to unbend and enjoy the animated conversation of an avowedly good talker, which is certainly not to be had if the stiffness of a Court is to restrain a natural flow of high spirits, and check its vivacity at every turn. Moreover, Sir Walter was not entertained at Windsor Castle, that most magnificent of royal residences, where the grandeur and constraint of a Court are in keeping with the external surroundings of the palace; but at the lodge in Windsor forest, a cottage *ornée*, where, the king was wont to retire with his immediate suite, and where, with his small party of intimates, he would relax the *etiquette* which a monarch is bound to maintain when *en evidence*.

Although Scott's stay in London is not a long one, he meets many men of interest; and, indeed, whether in Edinburgh or London, he is constantly visited by literary men and women of eminence. Lord Byron he met early in life. Tom Moore's visit to Abbotsford is one of the first events chronicled in the *Journal*; and the pleasure he felt in the society of Mrs. Hemans, is more than once recorded in its second volume. Although space forbids our enlarging on Scott's friends, we cannot refrain from quoting an excellent story with which Sir Walter endeavours to counteract the peculiar melancholy which this lady tells him she always attached to the words "*no more*":—

"I could not help telling, as a different application of the words, how an old dame riding home along Cockensie Sands, pretty bowsy, fell off the pillion, and her husband, being in good order also, did not miss her till he came to Prestonpans. He instantly returned with some neighbours, and found the good woman seated amidst the advancing tide, which began to rise, with her lips ejaculating to her cummers, who she supposed were still pressing her to another cup, 'Nae a drop mair, I thank you kindly.'"

From London Sir Walter journeys to Paris, and this city seems disposed to outdo even London in the cordiality with which it welcomes the author of *Waverley*. Dinners, *soirées*, visits to the opera, and parties to St. Cloud, follow

one another in quick succession. Nor is French royalty behind the English king in its attentions. Scott and his daughter are invited to the Tuilleries, see the royal family pass along on their way to Mass, and in their turn are looked at with great interest. Scott writes :—

“The king, on passing out, did me the honour to say a few civil words, which produced a great sensation. Mad. la Dauphine and Mad. de Berrie curtsied, smiled and looked extremely gracious . . . We were conducted by an officer of the *Royal Gardes du Corps* to a convenient place in chapel, where we had the pleasure of hearing the grand Mass performed with excellent music.”

Amongst other notabilities, Scott meets Fenimore Cooper, the novelist, in Paris ; a man whom, as he says, has shown so much genius. He proposes to assist Sir Walter in gaining some profits from his books published in America, by entering them as the property of a citizen. Scott for awhile entertains the idea, as “every little helps ;” and money being a prime necessity to him, if ever he is again to be a free man, he is justified in making it wherever he could do so legitimately. We believe, however, that, as a fact, the suggestion was never carried out—one cause of Scott’s hesitation being a fear, that were he to consent to Cooper’s wish, the American public would not get his works at the low prices at which they had been accustomed to buy them. In Cooper’s own account of his meeting with Scott, he tells us that the latter was so obliging as to make him a number of flattering speeches, which, however, he did not repay in kind ; giving as a reason for his silence, the words of Dr. Johnson regarding his meeting with George III. : “It was not for me to bandy compliments with my sovereign.”

The continual civilities and compliments of the Parisians, however gratifying, become at length more than Scott can enjoy. He declares that he “feels like a bee that sips treacle,” and sighs after a little Scotch causticity. He nevertheless cordially admits that he feels gratified by his warm reception, and writes :—

“Ere I leave *la belle France*, it is fit I should express my

gratitude for the unwontedly kind reception which I met with at all hands. It would be an unworthy piece of affectation did I not allow that I have been pleased—highly pleased—to find a species of literature, intended only for my own country, has met such an extensive and favourable reception in a foreign land, where there was so much *a priori* to oppose its progress.”

Scott makes but a short halt in London on his return, and is soon safely back in Edinburgh, attending the Court of Sessions, and devoting every spare moment to his literary work. His journey was, on the whole, highly successful, not alone for its immediate object—the obtaining authentic materials for his *Life of Napoleon*—but also, as restoring to his mind a healthy and cheerful tone; and he returned to Scotland with renewed hope, and even increased industry for the prosecution of his task.

The following winter was a trying one. The weather was unusually inclement, and Sir Walter suffered from frequent and severe attacks of acute rheumatism. The pain was sometimes so intense that he could hardly sit in his chair; and yet, through all his sufferings, his literary labour never flagged, and it was during these months of trying illness that his *Life of Napoleon* and the *Canongate Chronicles* shaped themselves into their present form. We are glad to be able to record that such courageous industry was not unrewarded. *Woodstock* is soon disposed of for £8,000; and in the following year the *Life of Napoleon* is sold for £11,000. Many more such substantial sums will go far to free Sir Walter from his liabilities; and if life and strength last, he may yet see himself reinstated in his old position.

It was shortly after the publication of *Napoleon*, that Scott and Cadell, one of the trustees for his creditors, matured the idea of bringing out a handsome and uniform edition of all Scott's works, both his poetical writings and his fiction. These volumes were intended to be prefaced by biographical sketches, and to be illustrated by historical and antiquarian notes. On this work, commonly called by Sir Walter his *Opus Magnum*, he bestowed immense pains. It necessitated the repurchase of the copyrights of some of Scott's earlier works, and to this, after some demur, the other

trustees and creditors consented, and it was decidedly for the interest of all concerned that they should do so. The success of this new edition exceeded even sanguine expectation. Before the termination of a year, eight volumes had been issued, and the monthly sales had gone up as high as 35,000 copies. Thus, besides the undiminished industry with which Scott continued the composition of his new works, he had discovered a mine of wealth in those already issued; and whilst writing *The Fair Maid of Perth*, *Anne of Geierstein*, and finishing the last series of *Scotch Tales of a Grandfather*, he would yet find time to correct and annotate the proof-sheets of his *Opus Magnum*. No wonder that, about this time, he describes himself as having become "a writing automaton;" though, we must add, an automaton of an unusually imaginative species.

Such incessant labour at length, alas! demanded its usual penalty. The human machine is not impassible, and the human brain cannot be overtaken without retribution following thereon. Scott was only fifty-nine; but the last four years had been no ordinary ones in his life. In every sense of the term he had been tried: by money losses, by domestic sorrow, by the death of old and valued friends; and at last by that of his trusty and faithful servant, his factotum, Tom Purdie, whose name so frequently occurs in the *Journal*; and these blows had followed one another in rapid succession. Through all of them he carries the same brave front, and, moreover, never relaxes his extraordinary labours; but nature is inexorable, and now demands that its debt, too, shall be paid.

In February, 1830, he had an alarming seizure of a paralytic nature, which—although at the time he mastered it so completely as to allow its occurrence to remain secret—was soon succeeded by others of a like character. Added to his precarious health, anxious and observant friends soon discover an unevenness in the excellency of his literary work which presages ill for the future. He was at this time working at his *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*, and on the fourth series of the *Tales of a Grandfather*; and, though both contain passages equal to the writing of his

best days, yet, on the whole, that level is not sustained. Nor can more be said for *Castle Dangerous*, or *Count Robert of Paris*, the two last novels Scott published, of which, although by an indiscriminating public they were welcomed with rapture, to Lockhart he privately owns that he felt ashamed. Seeing his failing health, it is probable that a proposed change in his life was not unacceptable to Scott, and that, after having acted as a Clerk of Sessions for more than twenty-six years, he gladly fell in with the Government proposal now to retire, exchanging his salary of £1,300 a-year for an allowance of £800. To this, the English ministry of the day were quite ready to add a pension of £500, so that he should regain the complete freedom of his time, without suffering any pecuniary loss—would Sir Walter accept it. Scott, however, was unwilling to do so; and, though he felt it necessary to make the offer known to his creditors, as he had no right to refuse money which really belonged to them, he at the same time let them know the extreme distaste he should feel at accepting what the Government was considerate enough to offer. We are glad to add, that on this, as on every other occasion, Scott's creditors behaved with their usual delicacy and consideration, and gratified Sir Walter greatly by begging him to do no injury to his feelings in the matter, but to forego the extra pension.

In spite of his exemption from official duties, Scott's condition does not greatly improve. No wonder it does not; for he has simply exchanged the semi-mechanical work in Court, which occupied so many of his hours, for continuous and exciting labour at his desk. After each attack his physicians could but repeat their advice that he should follow a certain regimen, and abstain from working his brain. The former injunction Sir Walter followed scrupulously, but as decidedly ignored the second, maintaining that work was a positive necessity to him. To Lockhart, who ventured on offering him the same advice, he even says: "I foresee distinctly that if I were to be idle, I should go mad. In comparison to this, death is no risk to shrink from."

His failing health was now aggravated by political excitement. These were the years immediately preceding the passing of the first Reform Bill of 1832; and all England and Scotland were in a turmoil. Scott was too zealous a constitutionalist not to view the approaching Liberal change with apprehension. Though far from being a bigoted Tory, he dreaded the idea of a popular franchise, and personally interposed in the local politics of his neighbourhood. The elections, at this date, were often occasions of riot and serious disturbance, and those who espoused the Conservative and unpopular side lay in danger even of actual maltreatment. Sir Walter's carriage on one occasion was pelted, and he himself had to bide his time at an inn, and then make his escape through bye lanes. He was ill-fitted at this time for any disturbance of his accustomed calm; and the excitement of the election at Jedborough was followed by months of serious illness.

From May to October, 1831, Scott's *Journal* is silent. It then opens with the ominous words: "I have been very ill;" and it is clear that the end is not very far distant. In order to avoid a Scotch winter, Sir Walter consents to spend the ensuing months in the south of Europe; and in September he leaves Abbotsford, first for London and Portsmouth, whence he sails in a man-of-war for Malta. Here Scott spends nearly a month; and feeling revived by the genial air of the Mediterranean, he is able to enjoy the picturesqueness of the island, and the mediæval associations with which it abounds, and which to him were ever attractive. From Malta he proceeds to Naples, and there finds his second son, Charles, ready to receive him; and with his daughter, Anne, they spend the winter agreeably in a palazzo—the Italians vieing with the English residents in making their stay a pleasant one.

Were we to judge alone from the *Journal*, we should suppose that Sir Walter had now every reason to rejoice, for here the imagination seizes him that his debts are fully paid, and that he is a rich man, who can "play the good papa with my family, without thinking on pounds, shillings, and pence." As a fact, the sums received by Scott during the

last six years of his life—extraordinarily large as they were—still left him owing not less than £54,000 at the time of his death. Sir Walter's life was insured for £22,000; but it was not until 1847 that his liabilities were finally extinguished, and that his estate became completely unfettered. Still, no one can regret that, though a delusion, this dream should have solaced the last months of Scott's life. If he was not free, he fully merited to be free; and though the belief that his creditors were paid was a vain fancy at that date, yet, as we have just stated, it was an accomplished fact some few years later.

Although apparently enjoying life at Naples, Scott's health cannot have seriously improved; for, when once he decides on turning homewards, the journey has to be accomplished with all the precautions necessary for an invalid. Of the journey, however, the *Journal* tells us nothing, the last unfinished entry being made on the morning after his arrival in Rome:—"We slept reasonably, but the next morning—."

Of this next morning, alas! we shall never hear more; and we regretfully close a volume which has changed an author, whose works we have read and re-read with delight, into a personal friend; to whose thoughts and wishes we have been admitted; and whose behaviour, whether in joy or sorrow, we feel we shall do well to emulate.

CECIL CLAYTON.

THE EVERY-DAY LIFE OF A COUNTRY PARISH PRIEST IN GERMANY.

LAST summer I received a warm invitation from Father H——, a German friend, who had not long been appointed parish priest in an out-of-the-way part of the Eifel, the highlands of the Rhine. The name of the village was Lommersdorf. I confess that I had never heard of it

before, and even since I have not been able to discover that it has any place in history. My friend assured me that the almost ubiquitous British tourist had not yet explored it. This decided me to accept the offer. I was much interested by what I saw and heard during my visit, and it has struck me that some account of it may interest my brother priests who have not had a similar opportunity.

Starting from Cologne on the afternoon of Sunday, August 23rd, I arrived, after a weary journey along the Euskirchen-Treves railway, at a station named Blankenheim. My friend was there to meet me. After a hearty greeting he explained that the town of Blankenheim was three miles distant, and that our destination was seven miles beyond that. A broken-down fly, drawn by a couple of sorry nags, was to carry us. We reached our first stage shortly after sunset. The little town was crowded with holiday-folk, in their best, for it happened to be the Kermess. All the meat in the inn had disappeared, so we had to put up with a dish of eggs, washed down with Moselle wine. While we were taking our meal we could hear some admirable part-singing in an adjoining apartment. I was at once reminded of old college-days, for the strains were the familiar "On a bank two Roses fair." The gathering presently broke up with the health-song, from the well-known collection of glees, entitled "Das Rütli."

The less said the better about our second stage. Night had now set in; it was quite dark, and the rain was coming down in torrents. One of the springs of our conveyance had previously been broken and patched up, and it was doubtful whether it would last the journey. The driver slowed to a walking pace, and got down from his box now and then to inspect the makeshift. He used to report its condition to my host in a jargon which I could not understand, and then he advanced more cautiously than before. When we reached Lommersdorf we immediately went to bed, for I found that we should have to be up soon after five.

Next morning at a quarter to six I went to the church,

and found Father H—— already saying mass. Every place was filled. At six I had to sing a Requiem for a long-deceased benefactor of the parish. No one was now in the church except the sacristan, who sang the plain-chant through in a loud and not unmusical voice. After breakfast my good friend prepared to show me round, and to answer my numerous questions. And now I had better lay aside the form of a diary, and at once describe the scenes of his labours, and give the substance of our many conversations.

The village of Lommersdorf is situated on the undulating table-land in the northern angle formed by the Rhine and the Ahr. Its inhabitants are the peasant-proprietors of the surrounding fields. Some five or six miles off are the ruins of the castle of the Counts of Ahrenberg, formerly lords of all this part of the country; but the labours of Stein in the early part of the century transferred the ownership of the soil to the people. There every rood of ground maintains its man. The land is poor, and the climate too bleak for the vine; there is little pasture, and the farming is almost entirely arable. This kind of cultivation, however, makes the people industrious and thrifty. The houses are solidly built, and within are tidy and clean. Religion and education are held in the highest respect; no men are so honoured as the priest (Herr Pastor) and the schoolmaster; no buildings can compare with the church, the presbytery, and the school. Sunday is strictly observed; but even on week days, as we have seen, the church is crowded. The common greeting is "Gelobt sei Jesus Christus" (Praised be Jesus Christ); and the answer is "In Ewigkeit. Amen" (For ever. Amen). The beggar, the thief, and the policeman—those three products of advanced civilization—are almost unknown. Marriage is always deferred until the parties are in a position to bring up a family, and in order to obtain this the young of both sexes betake themselves to the neighbouring large towns during the winter months. It was from villages like this that the sturdy peasants marched in triumph to Gravelotte and Sedan.

Often, as I sat in their cottages or watched them gather-

ing in the harvest, did Goldsmith's beautiful lines come into my mind:—

“ Yet still, e'en here, content can spread a charm,
 Redress the clime, and all its rage disarm.
 Though poor the peasant hut, his feasts though small,
 He sees his little lot the lot of all ;
 Sees no contiguous palace rear its head,
 To shame the meanness of his humble shed ;
 No costly lord the sumptuous banquet deal,
 To make him loathe his vegetable meal ;
 But calm, and bred in innocence and toil,
 Each wish contracting fits him to the soil.

At night returning, every labour sped,
 He sits him down the monarch of a shed ;
 Smiles by his cheerful fire, and round surveys
 His children's looks, that brighten at the blaze ;
 While his loved partner, boastful of her hoard,
 Displays her cleanly platter on the board ;
 And haply too some pilgrim, thither led,
 With many a tale repays the nightly bed.”

The church is not unlike what one sees in an English village. It is too small for the wants of the people, and is about to be enlarged and restored. The interior has rather a poverty-stricken appearance, in comparison with country churches here. There are, of course, no pews for the squire and gentry, and the walls are adorned with no monuments ; but the sanctuary was well kept, and, as I found, the supply of vestments and sacred vessels was excellent. At the eastern end of the little church-yard stands the priest's house. It is low, long, and straggling, with a kitchen-garden and a square plot of grass in front. When Father H—— was appointed, it was put into thorough repair by the government ; but all the furniture had to be supplied by himself.

It may be well to explain at once the sources of a parish priest's income. The Rhine provinces were assigned to Prussia by the Treaty of Vienna. As the population was almost entirely Catholic, the new government undertook to respect the rights of the Church ; consequently, the parish priests are almost in the same position

as English Protestant rectors. My friend has a glebe of about forty acres, which he lets ; he receives a portion of a tax corresponding to the English tithe, but levied by the government ; he also receives the stipends for masses for deceased benefactors ; and, lastly, there are voluntary gifts of his parishioners on occasions of marriages, funerals, &c. Out of the tax the government pays the sacristan and organist, provides altar requisites, and keeps the church and house in repair. Every year the parish priest has to fill up a form accounting for all his receipts and expenditure, to be forwarded to the Vicar-General at Cologne. The average income is about £150. Before being appointed to a parish, a priest must have served at least twelve or thirteen years as a curate, and must have passed an examination to prove that he is qualified. As far as I could ascertain, the examination is not a difficult one. The candidate must show a fair practical knowledge of the administration of the sacraments, of preaching and catechizing, of the liturgy, of plain-chant, and of the duties and rights of a parish priest. Success in the examination is not immediately followed by an appointment. When a parish falls vacant, a notice to that effect is inserted in the diocesan gazette, which is sent round to all the clergy. Any duly qualified priest may apply for the post. The appointments are made partly according to seniority and partly by selection. Thus an important town parish would be given to a curate of eighteen or twenty years' standing, or to one who had distinguished himself in literary or pastoral labours. Of course, country parish priests are sometimes transferred to the towns. The diocese of Cologne, to which my host belonged, contains over 800 parishes and 1,600 priests.

After the church and priest's house, the next place that interested me was the school. Elementary education is entirely in the hands of the State, which owns the buildings and pays all the salaries. Certain hours are set apart for religious instruction, which is given by the priest. This system works well in a place like Lommersdorf, where there is not a single Protestant. As the harvest was going on during my visit, the children were keeping half time at

school. They assembled at seven in the morning; secular instruction was given for two hours, followed by an hour for catechism. At ten they were free to go and help their fathers and mothers in the fields. As a rule, the inspectors (not examiners) of the schools are priests, and in this way they possess some control over the masters and mistresses. The English priest, harassed by school debts, may well envy his German brethren, and long for a similar system of State education.

Such is the framework of a country parish priest's life. The life itself has many consolations; but it is very lonely. None of the villagers can afford the priest that equal intercourse which is so necessary to men in every station of life. The neighbouring clergy are his only associates; and, as the villages are far apart, their visits must be rare, even in fine weather. He has, therefore, to fall back upon the companionship of his pipe and his books. I was present at a little clerical gathering at Lommersdorf, and I was taken to some of the other villages. I was much struck with the friendliness of the priests towards each other, and towards me, a stranger. My imperfect knowledge of German, however, prevented me from taking much part in the conversation, and it was also a drawback that I could not smoke the enormous pipes offered to me. The refreshments were a small glass of cognac, coffee and cakes, and afterwards Moselle or Rhine wine. I should here mention that Father H—— has some exceptional resources. During the Kulturkampf he had been obliged to leave his native country. He remained some time in Brussels, and afterwards was on the English mission for five years. His excellent knowledge of English and French now stands him in good stead. When I was with him he had two pupils—one of them being a young Frenchman about to enter St. Cyr, the great military school of France. We often talked in a friendly way about the last and coming wars. It has already been arranged that when our French friend enters the Rhine provinces at the head of his victorious squadrons, the village of Lammersdorf shall be exempted from all exactions. I know of no better way of

acquiring familiarity with German, than to spend a few months with some country priest, and to call in the aid of the schoolmaster.

A few days after my arrival the whole village turned out for a funeral. As the deceased was a young girl, the coffin was white, and the wooden cross (carried at the head of the procession and afterwards placed on the grave) was also white. At the offertory a collecting plate was placed on the altar, and the congregation, first the men and then the women, came up in procession to make their offerings. The amount, judging from the number of contributions, seemed to be considerable; but my friend afterwards allowed me to count it, and, though I found one hundred and eighty pieces of money, the total was only about two shillings. The pfennig, that convenient coin for charitable purposes, was the prevailing piece. I was also present at two weddings. There was nothing particular to remark about them, except that the brides were dressed in black; that the men also had wedding rings; and that the priest wound his stole about the joined hands of the parties.

But the event that most interested me was the Sunday processions. It was not any special ceremony. No elaborate preparations had been made. When the afternoon is fine the villagers walk out to a little oratory, about two miles distant, dedicated to St. Jodocus, the patron saint of these parts. On the road they recite the Rosary. At first I could not quite make out the second part of the Hail Mary, but I found that they were saying "Holy Mary, Mother of God, holy Jodocus, pray for us sinners," &c. Of course, the first part ended with the usual reference to the particular mystery which was being recited. Thus "blessed is the fruit of thy womb Jesus, whom thou, O Virgin, didst conceive by the Holy Ghost; whom thou, O Virgin, didst carry to Elizabeth," &c.

If I were to say that everyone in the village, except the blind and the lame, took part in the procession, I might be thought to exaggerate. But I was assured that such was the case; nay, I myself saw blind men led by the hand, and a poor fellow with one leg limping along. I noticed, too, that

none of the women or girls wore bonnets or hats. Father H—— told me that these were strictly forbidden by public opinion. When the young people make for the towns at the end of the harvest, they are allowed to adorn their heads as they please. They then present themselves in batches before the priest, and receive some good advice and his blessing. On the 1st of May they return ; but they must not enter the village in their town finery. The priest meets them some distance outside, and then the hats and bonnets are taken off and carried over the arm, not to be resumed until the following October.

Before my visit to Lammersdorf I had always been a staunch supporter of the French against the Germans, and I eagerly looked forward to the *revanche*. But who could wish that the Rhineland should be handed over to an infidel government, to be corrupted by the scoffing disciples of Voltaire? Under the rule of Protestant Prussia the Catholic religion is honoured and endowed ; under the French she is starved and despised. May it be long before the armies of France encamp in the Eifel, and take up their quarters in the happy village of Lammersdorf !

T. B. SCANNELL.

ARISTOTLE AND CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY.

THE Apostles and Fathers of the Apostolic age embraced no system of philosophy. In confirmation of the truths which they preached, they appealed not to metaphysics, but to the vivid recollection of the miracles of Christ and to the wonders that they themselves daily wrought. It was only reluctantly, and from the necessity of meeting the pagan philosophers with their own weapons, that Christian writers in the early centuries of our era summoned Greek philosophy to their aid. Gradually its utility for the systematic exposition of Christian truth

became more and more evident, and then it came into universal favour. The character of the Patristic philosophy, of the second and third centuries is frequently misrepresented. The Socinians, eager to trace the doctrines of the Trinity to pagan sources, strenuously maintain that the early Fathers were Platonists. Their view, however, receives scant support from writers familiar with Patristic literature. Justin Martyr, Tatien, Athenagoras, Hermias, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen, were all in favour of adopting an eclectic attitude towards Greek philosophy. The historian Mosheim holds that they were Neo-Platonists. His argument that the Fathers must have been Neo-Platonists because both are eclectic, involves the common fallacy of non-distribution of the middle term. The Christian dogma of the Trinity had been definitely expressed in the theology of St. Irenæus long before Neo-Platonism had taken form in the mind of the apostate Ammونیus Saccas. The early Fathers were eclectics, but their eclecticism was widely different from Neo-Platonism. What elements did the philosophy of Aristotle contribute to it? This question alone concerning the Patristic eclecticism bears upon the subject of the influence of Aristotle on the development of Catholic philosophy.

A word upon the general history of the Peripatetic school during the first centuries of the Christian era will shed much light upon this question, as well as upon others that are to appear later on. The followers of the Stagyrīte during this period, especially after the rise of Neo-Platonism, lapsed into Syncretism. This fusion of Aristotelic principles with pernicious doctrines borrowed from other systems could not fail to excite in the minds of orthodox Christians a lasting prejudice against Peripatetic teaching. In the writings of the two distinguished commentators, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Themistius, the philosophy of Aristotle is distinctly Syncretistic, and each, because of his eminence being followed by a train of imitators, this spurious Aristotelianism endured for a very long period. One subject brought prominently to the front by Alexander and Themistius, and destined to attract considerable attention in later times, was

the nature of the active and passive intellects. Alexander held that the *intellectus agens* is not a faculty of the individual soul, but is the same for all; that the *intellectus possibilis* is only a disposition, a mere *potentia obedientialis* in the organic faculties of sense, to whose vicissitudes it is subject; and that, consequently, the immortality of the individual human soul is only a figment of the fancy. Themistius, on the contrary, taught that both intellects inhere in the same substance, and that this substance, which is the individual human soul is, consequently, spiritual and immortal. Even at the present day both views have their adherents. Alexander of Aphrodisias and Ernest Rénan are but the extremities of a chain of philosophical development the intermediate links of which are supplied by Averroës and Rosmini.

Such, in general terms, was the character of the Peripatetic philosophy in early Patristic times. Between it and the Christian thought of the period there was very little contact of a positive character. Even if the Syncretism described above were not present at all, Aristotle's belief in the eternity of the world, and his denial of the immortality of the human soul—doctrine so incompatible with the foundations of Christian belief—could not fail to excite strong prejudices in that age of fervent faith. The physical, metaphysical, and ethical works of Aristotle had no share in determining the *content* of the Patristic philosophy at any time, although the *Organon* or logical writings contributed largely to moulding its form. The value of the *Organon* was acknowledged in the catechetical school of Alexandria in the time of Origen. Gregory of Nazianzen, the pupil of Themistius, wrote a compendium of it. Boethius translated portions of it into Latin. This translation of Boethius occupies a very important place in the history of philosophy. For down to the time of John of Salisbury, who died in the year 1180, it was the only means possessed in the Western Church of becoming acquainted with the teaching of Aristotle. John of Salisbury was the first to bring the entire *Organon* under the notice of his western contemporaries. During the whole of the Patristic era, therefore, the only Aristotelian

source from which Christian philosophy derived assistance was the *Organon*, and in the Western Church only the relatively small portion of the *Organon* translated into Latin by Boethius.

We now come to the period when the entire extant writings of Aristotle were brought to the University of Paris, then rapidly rising to that position of fame and influence which it afterwards occupied. Almost immediately a great progressive change took place in scholastic philosophy. To determine, therefore, under what guise and with what immediate results the works of Aristotle were first placed within reach of the scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages, cannot fail to be deeply interesting to every student of the history of philosophy.

The scholastics owed their first acquaintance with Aristotle's entire system to two very different historical events—the Mahommedan invasion of Spain and the Eastern Crusades of the Christians. The works of Aristotle were first brought to Paris by Jewish merchants, who had received them from some of the Mahommedan professors, then in possession of all the chairs in the Spanish Universities. That the full bearing of this event upon subsequent philosophical development may be understood, it will be necessary to append some details of the history and character of the Mahommedan philosophy.

The Mahommedans—as, indeed, the whole Semitic race—were originally hostile to philosophy. Their religion was, however, intrinsically adapted for an alliance with the Peripatetic rather than any other system. It was essentially anti-Trinitarian in character. Islam means belief in the *personal* unity of the Deity, and the word *Moslim* signifies those who accept that doctrine. Mahommedan prejudices should, therefore, naturally first give way before a system such as Aristotle's, which favours a rigid monotheism. Extrinsic causes concurred to effect an amalgamation between them. Under the care of the Nestorian heretics in Syria, the Peripatetic philosophy had long flourished in the School of Edessa; and when the School of Edessa was closed by the edict of the Emperor Zeno,

it lingered on until it got a new lease of life in the schools of Nisibis and Grandisapora. Now there were many Syrian Nestorians in Arabia, even when Mahommedanism commenced to be preached, and the physician and friend of the false prophet himself was one of them. A little later, when the Arabians entered upon their career of conquest, Syria was one of the first provinces to accept their rule. These facts, together with the predisposition above referred to, supply an explanation of the origin of Mahommedan philosophy in the East. Very soon it made its way to Europe. The militant spirit of their religion impelled the Mahommedans towards Africa, with their war-cry of the Koran, tribute, or the sword. They won over the province of Mauritania, and those who remained to colonize it were ever afterwards called Moors. Some of the Moors subsequently crossed over into Spain, drove the Christians to the mountains, and took possession of all the fairest districts of the Peninsula for themselves. That terribly dark cloud of Mahommedan invasion was not, however, altogether without its silver lining. As Alexander the Great, when he subjugated the peoples of the East, made them some compensation for the loss of political power by placing within their reach the resources of Greek civilization, so did the Moors, by spreading acquaintance with the works of Aristotle, do something to counterbalance the physical suffering and spiritual evils which they caused wherever they appeared. Widespread as the Mahommedan Empire had become, it was ruled over by one Caliph, or successor of Mahommed, down to the year 755 A.D. Five years previously a change of dynasty had taken place, the Ommiads having been expelled by the Abbasides. A member of the old reigning family fled into Spain, and established a new Caliphate at Cordova. There were henceforward an Eastern and a Western Caliphate, analogous to the Eastern and Western Empires. But, notwithstanding the political separation thus effected between the Moors and the Saracens, there was sufficient intercommunication between them to secure a certain unity in their philosophy. The Peripatetic School among the Moors rose from the ruins in which the philosophy of the

Saracens had been laid by the scepticism of Algazel. Averroës of Spain was the logical descendant of Avicenna of Bokhara. Every important element of the Mahommedan philosophy finds a place in the writings of these two commentators. A brief exposition, therefore, of the teaching of each will be the most expeditious method of revealing the spirit of the entire Mahommedan system.

With Avicenna, who was born in the province of Bokhara, in the year 980 A.D., the Peripatetic philosophy lost much of the Syncretism with which previous commentators had invested it. He retained the Neo-Platonic theory of emanation, but he strictly adhered to the teaching of Aristotle on the eternity of matter, the principle of individuation, and the nature of the universal. His exposition of the last point, because of its simplicity, accurateness, and clearness calls for special notice. He held that the universal, *as such*, derives its being from the mind, and exists in it alone. He distinguished between the *universalia ante res*, or the prototypal ideas in the divine intellect, the *universalia in rebus*, or the immanent essences of things, and the *universalia post res*, or the universal concepts formed from the consideration of individual objects with the aid of the intellectual processes of abstraction and comparison.

Whatever may have been the defects of Avicenna's exposition—and they were many—we cannot but rejoice that at a period when on the one hand the very foundations of science were threatened by the Nominalists, and on the other, a thoroughgoing Pantheism was being fostered by the Ultra-Realists, such satisfactory views on the subject of the controversy were introduced to the notice of the disputants in Western Europe. The general reader cannot well realize the far-reaching consequences of the view taken on this point. Were contemporary English thinkers but to adopt the sound teaching of Avicenna they might without sinking their blind prejudices against the Scholastics escape from the intellectual chaos into which they have almost hopelessly plunged the mind of their country.

Between Avicenna and Averroës there is a natural bond of connection. Dante, himself a great philosopher,

associates their names in the fourth canto of his *Inferno*, where he represents Aristotle as holding philosophical converse with his admirers in the first circle of hell :

“ Vidi il maestro di color che sanno,
 Seder tra filosofica famiglia

 Avicenna e Galieno,
 Averrois, che il gran commento feo.”

Tiraboschi, in his *History of Italian Literature*, calls Averroës the parent of modern philosophical impiety. However this may be, the value of his commentaries was universally admitted throughout the Middle Ages. He was born at Cordova, in the year 1126 A.D. As Aristotle was called “the Philosopher,” Averroës was called “the Commentator.” His admiration of the Peripatetic philosophy was immoderate. One of its good results was to remove Syncretistic elements even still more than Avicenna had done. His views on the question of Universals were identical with Avicenna’s. The most characteristic portion of his philosophical creed deals with the nature of the active and passive intellects. The opinions of Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius have been already explained. Averroës professed to aim at a synthesis of both. Identifying the *Intellectus agens* with the *Intellectus possibilis*, he held, with Themistius, that both inhere in the same substance ; but, with Alexander, he taught that man’s share in the origin of ideas is solely due to a mere disposition of the animal or organic faculties of sense. This view is clearly as irreconcilable with the doctrine of individual immortality as the opinion of Alexander.

Such was the garb in which Aristotle’s entire philosophy first attracted attention in the Western Church. Among the first to hail the advent of the new doctrines is said to have been Amalrich, or Amaury of Chartres. Educated in the opinions of Scotus Erigena, the genuine elements of the Peripatetic philosophy in the writings of the Mahommedans naturally fell in less with his preconceived notions than did the Neo-Platonic elements which were intermingled with them. The result was a Pantheism similar to that of Erigena, and based not upon Aristotelic principles at all, but

on a corrupted Platonism. A moment's comparison of the Platonic theory of ideas with the views of Erigena and Amalrich will suffice to show the real origin of their system. Between the Platonic ideas, which were supposed extra-mental realities, relations were represented to exist corresponding to the relations which exist between logical concepts. The highest logical concept is that of *being*; the highest Platonic idea is an assumed external reality corresponding to it. The concept of *being* becomes differentiated into the highest generic concepts, and at the same time constitutes a unity between them. Likewise the highest Platonic idea is differentiated into subordinate ideas, and at the same time constitutes their unity. We may carry on this parallelism between the two orders of evolution, the subjective and the objective, until we reach the lowest specific concepts on the one hand, and the corresponding extra-mental ideas on the other. We thus see the hierarchy of ideas constituted by unity passing into plurality, and we have only to reverse the process in order to see plurality passing back into unity. So long as we confine ourselves to the dialectical development of the concept of *being* in the subjective order we shall be in perfect harmony with Peripatetic principles; but when we pass to the objective order, and attribute to the universal, *as such*, an extra-mental existence—in one word, the moment we *hypostasize* the universal—we pass from the Lyceum to the Academy. This Platonic theory of ideas presents to the imagination the appearance of a tree covered with the fairest blossoms, but when we study its development we see the blossoms for the most part changing into Dead Sea fruit in the form of extravagant Pantheistic systems. How little there is in Neo-Platonism, or the Pantheism of Erigena and Amalrich, or the system of Hegel, that is not a modification of Plato's theory of ideas! Here the systems of Erigena and Amalrich alone concern us. By a sort of divine evolution, God, like the highest idea, is represented as passing first into the highest *genera*, then through the intermediate *genera*, next through the lowest species, until finally individuals are reached. All ultimately return into the bosom of the Deity, from Whom they emanated.

This system may be popularly explained by means of an illustration. If, standing on the sea-shore and looking seaward, we descry something on the verge of horizon, we can only at first vaguely characterize it as an object. As it comes nearer, we may perceive that it is a ship. Gradually as it approaches we may discover in succession that it is a steamship, a man-of-war, a British man-of-war, until finally its very name and individual characteristics become known. If we now suppose it to recede from view, its appearances to our vision pass through the reverse order. What is to be noted is, that from start to finish the object is precisely the same—only its manifestations to our consciousness vary. In a manner somewhat analogous, Erigena and Amalrich conceive the Divinity, while remaining one and undivided, to pass and repass through various manifestations corresponding to the logical divisions of the concept of *being*. But why do I introduce their system here? I introduce it to explain the ecclesiastical prohibition of the study of the works of Aristotle issued by the Provincial Council of Paris, in the year 1209 A.D. The followers of Amalrich claimed for their views the authority of Aristotle. The Archbishop of Sens, Peter of Corbeil, who presided over the Council, condemned the false doctrines and their sources *as alleged*. The prohibition against the physical and metaphysical works was renewed in 1215 by the papal legate when he gave his approbation to the statutes of the University of Paris. Sixteen years later Gregory IX. forbade the study of Aristotle's *Physics* until such time as the erroneous views which it contained regarding the eternity of the world would be expurgated from it. All ecclesiastical hostility ceased in the year 1237. After the successful siege of Constantinople by the Crusaders, the pure Greek text of Aristotle was brought back to France. Albertus Magnus and S. Thomas had special translations made for themselves. Ecclesiastical prohibitions now gave way to express commands to expound the Peripatetic philosophy in the schools and universities. He who had been nominally under the ban of the Church was now styled "the Philosopher," and designated by some *præcursor Christi in naturalibus*, as John the Baptist had been styled

praeursor Christi in gratuitis. The schoolmen only needed an introduction to the genuine Peripatetic philosophy in order to admire it. The Aristotle condemned by the Council of Paris was not the Aristotle revered by Albertus Magnus and S. Thomas. The sudden change of attitude, therefore, in the Western Church towards the Aristotelic writings, when properly interpreted, cannot excite surprise.

Such is the history of the *external* connection between Aristotle's teaching and Catholic philosophy. It only remains to describe on some future occasion the characteristics of the scholastic philosophy at different periods, in order that a correct estimate may be formed of how far the perfection it achieved in the time of Albertus Magnus and S. Thomas is to be attributed to the writings of Aristotle.

T. E. JUDGE.

Theological Questions.

A MARRIAGE QUESTION.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—I feel confident that I can rely on your usual kindness to afford me space in the next number of the I. E. RECORD for a few additional remarks on the instructive marriage question which has been discussed in its pages for some time past. As will be seen by your last issue, I expressed an opinion that the marriage contracted in St. John's parish—their parental domicile—by two servants, who, whilst enjoying a quasi-domicile in St. Peter's, take in the same parish a house in which they intend to reside after their marriage, was either an invalid marriage, or, at all events, a doubtfully valid one. I formed this opinion because it seemed to me (1) that the servants in question—John and Mary—having acquired a true domicile in St. Peter's by the fulfilment of the two conditions necessary and sufficient to acquire it, viz.: (a) actual residence in the parish, and (b) the intention of living there permanently, manifested by the taking of the house; they thereby (2) lost their domicile in St. John's, where, consequently, they could not get married without the permission of the parish priest of St. Peter's, or of

his Ordinary. Having quoted in support of this view, among other authorities, the following decree of the S. Rota :—‘ Si parochialitas ad effectum validitatis matrimonii contrahitur ex habitatione, et animo permanendi per aliquod Justum temporis intervallum, non est sane inquirendum ex qua causa vel in cujus domo habitaverit quis; sed satis est quod ibidem de facto habitaverit cum animo permanendi,’ &c.—a decree which seemed to me to establish beyond doubt the sufficiency in order to acquire a domicile of actual residence in a place with the intention of living there permanently—*factum* and *animus*; and to preclude the necessity of inquiring whether the intention, provided it was for the requisite space of time, was absolute or conditional; or what were the causes that might have determined it—having quoted this decree, I said: ‘Theologians, too, as far as I am aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions on this point; or about the causes determining such intentions. Sufficient for them that the conditions above mentioned exist. They then apply the good old principle, “Ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.”’

“The writer of a severe criticism of my remarks in the last number of the I. E. RECORD, commenting on these words says :—‘We contend that theologians do trouble themselves about the question of absolute and conditional intentions. They do not, perhaps, treat of them formally and explicitly; but surely it will suffice, if we show that implicitly they insist on the principle of an absolute intention.’ In order to test the teaching of theologians on the point under discussion, he cites in the first part of his disquisition a few examples in the form of Case A, and Case B; and also gives passages from the works of theologians to prove that an absolute intention is, according to them, indispensably necessary to *originate* a domicile or quasi-domicile.

I.

“‘Case A.—A person from the country comes to Dublin—let us say, to prosecute a lawsuit. He engages fixed lodgings. He does not know on what day the case will be called, or how long it will last; but believes it may detain him in town for seven months. He intends to remain to the end of the case, and to return home immediately after its termination. Does this man acquire a quasi-domicile in Dublin? We can fancy our corres-

pondent arguing:—(a) This man fulfils the first condition for quasi-domicile—*factum habitationis* ; (b) he has *some intention* of residing there *per majorem anni partem* ; and (c) “ the theologians, too, so far as I am aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions ; ” therefore (d) he has acquired a quasi-domicile in Dublin.’

“ Really, if I may express an opinion on this purely imaginary solution attributed to me, and on a case quite different from that I was discussing—this one having reference to quasi-domicile, the other to domicile—I must say that I do not object very much to it. If the person in the case intended to remain in Dublin for seven months, as is supposed, I think it might be very fairly argued that he had acquired a quasi-domicile in the city. But, continues the writer : ‘ The theologians, however, on the contrary, would say that this man has not a quasi-domicile in Dublin.’

“ I may be allowed to interpose here, and to say that, as far as I know, the theologians would say nothing of the kind ; and certainly Ballerini does not say it in the passage about to be quoted from him. ‘ Ballerini,’ he says, ‘ for example writes :—“ Quando deest animus figendi alicubi domicilium [aut quasi-domicilium, nihil refert brevisne an longa ibi mora trahatur ; ita v.g. si peregrinus in quapiam consistas urbe opperians . . . litis alicujus exitum . . . quae reditum in patriam retardat . . . Etsi enim etiam quinquennio immo vel decennio moram in dies precariam ibi trahens permanear, nunquam illud domicilii jus acquires, quod ad matrimonium coram parocho, quasi tuo valide contrahendum sufficiat.” ’ (Gury-Ball., Pars. ii., n. 847, note a.) ‘ Ballerini,’ continues the same writer, ‘ does, not, indeed, use the words *absolute* and *conditional* intention ; but if we penetrate a little under the surface we shall see that he recognises the *principle* that conditional intention is of no avail, and that an absolute intention of residence is indispensably necessary to originate a domicile or quasi-domicile. For, in the example he gives, and in our example, the person commences to reside in a parish ; he intends to reside there as long as his business requires, but no longer ; he *intends* to reside there *ad majorem anni partem*, or for several years, *if necessary*, for his business ; and yet he does not acquire a domicile or quasi-domicile.’

“ In justice to the memory of Ballerini, I must say this teaching is none of his. Ballerini does not say that the person intended

to reside in the place for *seven months*, or for the *majorem anni partem*, or for several years, and yet does not acquire a domicile or quasi-domicile. He says nothing of the sort. So far from doing so, he speaks of a case where there is no intention whatsoever of remaining so long in the place as is manifest from the forms of expression he uses:—‘Quando deest animus figendi alicubi domicilium aut quasi-domicilium . . . si peregrinus in quapiam consistas urbe . . . moram in dies precariam ibi trahens perman eas.’ All forms of expression which indicate a want or absence of an intention of remaining in the place permanently, or for the greater part of a year; that is, for the space of time requisite to acquire a domicile or quasi-domicile. And if the writer of the criticism would penetrate a little further under the surface, and would, moreover, collate this note with note (a) Num. 839 by the same author, he would, perhaps, discover that it is precisely because of this want of an intention that Ballerini considers the person of whom he is writing devoid of a domicile or quasi-domicile; and not because ‘he recognises the *principle* that conditional intention is of no avail, and that an absolute intention of residence is indispensably necessary to originate a domicile or quasi-domicile.’

“This, at least, was Dr. Murray’s view of the case, as is evident from the following passage in which he interprets the mind of Ballerini. Dr. Murray, Num. 380, writes:—‘Si quis autem v.g. Dublinium adeat ad negotium aliquod agendum, putans id intra unum aut alterum mensem absolvendum esse.’ He does not extend the time to the *majorem anni partem*, or for several years, ‘et intendens statim, negotio absoluto, ad suos redire, etsi negotii compositio de mense in mensem usque ad annum aut biennium aut decennium producat, nullo tempore Dublinii quasi-domicilium habet: nullo enim tempore animum habuit ibidem per majorem aut etiam per magnam anni partem habitandi. Ballerini, n. 847.’

“*Case B.*—Under this heading the writer having laid down the theological axiom: ‘Quibus mediis domicilium vel quasi-domicilium contrahitur, iisdem etiam solvitur,’ proceeds to show, that as a conditional intention of *abandoning* a domicile or quasi-domicile already established is not sufficient to destroy it, so neither is it sufficient to *originate* it. I have no objection to the axiom here enunciated; I freely admit it. But it seems to me that its application is not faultless. To deduce an argument from the

case here given, it should have been first shown that the cases were perfectly parallel. In other words, it should have been shown that the conditions and circumstances under which the servants originated their domicile in St. Peter's, and the ladies coming to Dublin to get married lost theirs, were in all respects similar, save in the fact that in the one case there was question of beginning, in the other of terminating, a domicile. This was not done, nor to my mind could it be easily done. Waiving, however, this point for the present, let us see how his argument proceeds. 'Ladies,' he says, 'from the provinces not unfrequently come to Dublin to be married. The parish priest or curate of their native parish assists at their marriage. They then go on their wedding tour, and afterwards repair directly to the houses of their husbands, and continue to reside there. . . Can they be married in Dublin by the parish priest of their native parish? Did not their domicile cease when they left their native home? We can imagine our correspondent answering that the domicile ceased on their departure from home, because the *factum habitationis* ceased, and there was some intention of not returning; "and theologians, as far as he is aware, do not trouble themselves much about the question of absolute and conditional intentions." ' The answer, which he imagines I would give to this case, is purely fictitious. I can assure him that my solution of it would not be opposed to universal practice. It is surprising that it did not occur to him that I might have argued this:—the *factum habitationis* ceased, that is true; 'there was some intention of not returning,'—yes; but there was also some intention of returning; *i.e.*, in case the marriage was not celebrated. Again: 'these ladies have only a conditional intention of leaving their parental homes; therefore, I say, they have some intention of *not* leaving them; and these intentions of theirs of not severing their connection with their native homes, except by and through the celebration of their marriages, prevent the fulfilment of the second condition by which a domicile once acquired is lost. I shall here add (though it does not come within the scope of this controversy), that if these ladies, when leaving their homes to come to be married in Dublin, had declared their intention of abandoning their parental domiciles, by an act as formal as that by which John and Mary manifested their intention of acquiring a domicile in St. Peter's, I should hold their marriage, celebrated in Dublin in presence of the parish priest of their native parish only—without the

presence of the Dublin parish priest—to be very doubtful as to validity.

“The theologians whom he quotes in support of his contention, ‘that an absolute intention is indispensably necessary to *originate* a domicile or quasi-domicile,’ are, Dr. Murray (N. 376, 2°), and Zitelli (page 421, N. 3). Dr. Murray, in treating of the quasi-domicile of servants and certain other classes of persons, writes:—‘*Si alibi domicilium habeant, tunc aut intendunt locum ubi nunc sunt deserere, vel sciunt se ex eo amovendos esse ante majorem anni partem completam, aut intendunt in loco ubi nunc sunt per majorem anni partem habitare, moralem habentes certitudinem se ex eo ante id tempus completum non esse amovendos. In primo casu, non possunt contrahere nisi coram paracho domicilii. In casu secundo contrahere possunt coram paracho aut domicilii aut loci ubi nunc sunt, utpote hic quasi-domicilium habentes.*’

“With regard to this passage from Dr. Murray’s work, *De Mat.*, I may say, that the words here given in italics are not found in this context in the Resp. S. C. Inq. ad Postul. Syn. Pl. Manut.; neither have I seen them used in this sense by any other theologian; and therefore, if pressed, I should deny the necessity of the condition which they seem to imply. But, even accepting the authority of Dr. Murray, I fail to see that he ‘recognises the principle that an *absolute* intention of residence is necessary to originate a quasi-domicile.’ He does not, it is granted, ‘introduce the words *absolute* and *conditional* intention;’ he does require a moral certainty on the part of the persons, that they will continue to reside in the place for the greater part of a year; and I see no reason why John and Mary when taking the house in St. Peter’s could not have had a moral certainty, that they would reside in that parish, not only for the greater part of a year, but even for many years. In order to have this certainty, all that would be required would be, that at the time of taking the house they foresaw nothing that would be likely to prevent their intended marriage. Of course, such is the uncertainty of human affairs, something might afterwards happen that would prevent their marriage; something might occur which would prevent them from taking up their abode in the house they had taken; the ‘*nisi quid avocet*’ of theologians might be verified in their case—something might happen to call them away from the place; but, until that thing did actually

occur, and they had abandoned their intention of residing in St. Peter's, they would not cease to have their domicile in it. For, as Dr. Murray says elsewhere, to have a domicile in any place it is only necessary 'Ut quis habeat sedem (domum, conclave, quamcumque habitationem) in eo loco, cum intentione ibidem perpetuo habitandi,' &c. And 'quibus mediis domicilium contrehitur, iisdem etiam dissolvitur.'

"When introducing the authority of Zitelli he says:—'Our correspondent, too, quotes Zitelli. But how did the following passage escape his notice?—"Ad domicilium duo simul requiruntur, scil. habitatio et animus semper manendi, qui animus, nisi aut verbis expressus sit aut actis quae illum significant, ex decennali habitatione praesumitur. Cum autem praesumptio veritati cedat, omnino cessat, si constet aliquem ob accidentalem causam aliculi habitare, qua deficiente discessurus est; quod ei cessante tali conditione vel officio, quis ita habitare perseveret, ut ex circumstantiis erui debeat animus perpetuo manendi, domicilium contractum censebitur.'" Does not Zitelli here recognise the principle that conditional intention is insufficient to originate a domicile; and that it is only when the condition ceases a person can begin to have the 'animus perpetuo manendi'?

"I can assure him that the passage now quoted did not escape my notice; but I refrained from quoting it, because I thought it was quite sufficient to have quoted the authority of Konings and Schmalgrueber in support of the opinion I was advocating. Perhaps if I had quoted it, it would have been treated 'as an example of the loose and inaccurate forms of expression we sometimes meet even in our classical authors.' But when he asks: 'Does not Zitelli here recognise the principle that conditional intention is sufficient to originate a domicile; and that it is only when the condition ceases a person can begin to save the "animus perpetuo manendi"?' I must answer, negative, *ad utramque partem quaesiti*. Zitelli is in perfect accord on this point with the theologians whom I quoted. 'Two things,' he says, 'are simultaneously required to constitute a domicile, viz., *habitatio et animus semper manendi*, which intention (*animus*) if it be not expressed by word or mouth, or manifested by acts which declare it, is to be presumed (a legal presumption) from a residence of ten years in the place.' Here I may stay to remark, that John and Mary having taken a house in which they intend to reside in St. Peter's parish, have thereby manifested their

intention of residing there permanently ; and, consequently, there is no necessity for having recourse to a legal presumption in their case to determine the *animus semper manendi*. 'But,' continues Zitelli, 'as a presumption must give way to truth, this legal presumption ceases, if it be evident that a person resides in a place on account of some accidental cause or business, on the termination of which he purposes to leave ; but if, on the termination of such business, he does not leave, but continues to live on there, in such a way that from the circumstances of the case his intention of remaining there permanently can be inferred, he will then be considered to have acquired a domicile. To lose a domicile neither actual departure from the place, nor long absence is sufficient : it is necessary that the intention of not returning to it be made known by words or by acts.' Thus far Zitelli ; and it is quite manifest from his own words, that he does not recognise the principle that conditional intention—to which he does not even allude—is insufficient to originate a domicile. Neither does he say that it is only when the condition ceases, a person can begin to have the '*animus perpetuo manendi*.' It may not be out of place here to remark, that in the second part of the passage quoted, Zitelli is dealing principally with a case of '*simplex habitatio*,' as distinguished from domicile or quasi-domicile ; and this remark applies also to the passage quoted from Ballerini without any restriction. Having said so much about the teaching of the theologians on the point at issue, I shall conclude this point by saying that John and Mary fulfilled the only two conditions necessary to acquire a domicile, viz. (a) *habitatio*, et (b) *animus (expressus) semper manendi*. The Decree of the S. Rota says expressly that when these conditions are verified, we are not to inquire into the causes or reasons why the domicile was acquired. '*Non est, sane inquirendum ex qua causa vel in cujus domo habitaverit quis.*' And theologians, too, when they find that the two conditions above mentioned exist, do not trouble themselves about the question of absolute and conditional intentions on this point ; or about the causes determining such intentions, but act on the good old principle : '*ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.*' I am, therefore, still of opinion, that the marriage which had been contracted between John and Mary was either an invalid marriage, or, at least, a doubtfully valid one ; especially as it has not been shown that they retained their parental domicile, after they took the house in St. Peter's parish.

II.

“Had John and Mary lost their *parental domicile* before marriage?

“Writing on this part of the controversy, he says: ‘We argued in the January number of this periodical that even if John and Mary had acquired a domicile in St. Peter’s prior to their marriage, it might be contended that they also retained their parental domicile, as, according to the teaching of theologians, a person can have two domiciles at the same time.’

“As I wrote in your last issue, doubtless a person might have two domiciles—such cases are contemplated by theologians; but the question here is, not whether any person can have two domiciles at the same time, but whether these servants, in their peculiar circumstances, could have had two domiciles. I quoted the authority of Feije and Pope Benedict XIV., in order to show what conditions were necessary that a person might have at the same time two domiciles. Having done this, I said: ‘that John and Mary did not fulfil these conditions, and had no intention of fulfilling them, does not, I think, require proof.’ Theologians say that it is very difficult for any person to have two domiciles in the technical sense of the word. And, surely, anybody that remembers the conditions that are necessary to constitute a true domicile will be readily convinced of this. The conditions are of such a nature that a person judging the matter *a priori* would say, it is scarcely possible for anybody to have two domiciles; for, he would say, how can the ‘*habitatio*’ and the ‘*animus ibi perpetuo manendi*,’ which are required for each domicile, be verified in two places at the same time?

“However, as according to the voice of the Church, and the teaching of theologians, by which alone we are to be guided in these matters, a person may have two domiciles; I quote the authorities above mentioned to show what conditions they required to be fulfilled in order to have them. It was for him to prove that the requisite conditions were verified in the case of John and Mary. The *onus probandi* certainly rested with him; for, though theologians frequently speak of servants as belonging to that class of persons who may at the same time have a domicile and a quasi-domicile, I do not remember that they ever rank them among those who may have two domiciles.

“When commenting on these authorities he wrote:—‘Our correspondent undoubtedly quotes some standard authorities in

support of his views on this as well as on the preceding question ; but we cannot help suspecting that he did not allow himself sufficient time to digest and assimilate their teaching.' I shall again repeat the words of one of them, and leave him to do what he thinks I failed to accomplish. 'Tunc solum duobus domiciliis instructum aliquem *jure* appellari, cum in utroque aequaliter collocatus prudentium virorum judicio existimatur ; quod etiam *Juris Pontificii* auctoritate probatur . . . viris prudentibus placuit, in duobus locis posse aliquem habere domicilium, si utrobique ita se instruxit ut non ideo minus apud alterosse locasse videatur.' (Ben. XIV., *loc. cit.*)

"Though he did not try to prove that these servants fulfilled the conditions requisite to acquire two domiciles, he did attempt to explain the teaching of the theologians as applied to their case. In Ans. (a) he says :—'We must remember that a person can retain two acquired domiciles, even if he spends years away from both.' I answer, most certainly, *if* he has acquired them ; but that is the point at issue in this case. Therefore, *nego suppositum*. In Ans. (b) he writes :—'Our correspondent's doctrine is true of the *originating* of two domiciles, and it indicates, moreover, the *normal* way in which they are retained and continued.' I say, (a) the doctrine given was not mine ; I merely quoted the doctrine of Pope Benedict XIV. and Feije ; and only added of my own that it seemed to me that John and Mary had neither fulfilled nor intended to fulfil the conditions laid down by them. And I ask, (b) is it not of the *origination* of the two domiciles that we are treating ? Under Ans. (c) in support of his contention that it is not necessary for the *continuance* of two domiciles that a person shall be prepared at *each moment* to dwell in, or even retain, his two homes for equal terms of succeeding years, he quotes the example of a gentleman who has a domicile in Dublin and another in Kingstown ; and who retains his domicile in each place, though for some unforeseen cause he may be compelled to leave the country.

In reply, I say, all this may be very true ; but, *quid ad rem*. It is not denied that the gentleman in question might have the two domiciles ; it is denied that the servants could have them. And when he draws a conclusion of which he says, 'How very absurd !' I am sure most people will agree with him that it is ; but, then, it is his own exclusively. In concluding this portion of his argument he writes :—'Now,

the servants of whom we are writing retained their parental domicile with the quasi-domicile of their place of service.' I am not disposed to deny this assertion. Servants oftentimes retain, and, perhaps, not unfrequently too lose, their parental domicile when they go to service. Whether in an individual case they retain or lose it, is a question of fact which can be best determined by asking themselves what their intentions were when leaving home to go to service. And I have no doubt that all this was most carefully done by the parish priest or priests interested in the case. As Dr. Murray has it: 'Difficultates ex quaestionibus facti (v. g. utrum Caius Miles, Titia famula, alibi domicilium habeat), non ad theologiam solvendae pertinent sed in singulis casibus occurrentibus, ad industriam et prudentiam parochi.' 'And,' he continues, 'even if this quasi-domicile had become a domicile, their parental domicile would not cease from the mere fact that they had still only a few days or a few hours residence in their parental homes.' Not, I reply, from the fact that they had only a few days, &c., to reside in their parental homes; but from the fact that they having acquired a new domicile, and not being in a position to acquire or to retain two domiciles, the acquisition of the new domicile was a renunciation of the old one. 'Quibus enim mediis acquiritur domicilium iisdem dissolvitur.'

"Replying to this argument, which I made use of in my last communication also, he writes:—'We have already shown in our reply to the first question that the taking of the house in St. Peter's in no way whatsoever effected the parental domicile prior to the marriage.' If he has shown this, as he says he has, then I admit my argument is answered. But, with all due respect, I submit he has not shown it, and I shall leave the readers of the I. E. RECORD, and those interested, to judge for themselves. 'If John and Mary,' he continues, 'went home and got married during their period of service, during their quasi-domicile in St. Peter's, no one would seriously question the validity of their marriage.' Granted. 'And similarly there would be no doubt about the validity of their marriage, even after they had completed the period of their service.' Granted also. 'The purchase of the house in the circumstances did not indicate the renunciation of the parental domicile, but merely an intention of renouncing it soon; of renouncing it after their marriage.' I must deny this. The house was taken *intuitu futuri matrimonii*,

if you will; but it was taken before the marriage took place. The taking of it was of itself an external expression of the intention of residing permanently in the place where they were—it was a manifestation of the intention of acquiring a domicile. And the moment these two conditions were placed—actual residence and intentional permanency of abode—no matter why or for what cause they were placed; yea, even if they were placed in *fraudem legis et parochi*, that very moment the new domicile was acquired, and the old one was renounced. For these reasons I am of opinion, that there is still room for doubting the validity of the marriage of John and Mary celebrated in their native parish. Hoping the importance of the subject will be sufficient excuse for the length of this communication,—Faithfully yours,

“ALTER SACERDOS.”

Documents.

LETTER FROM THE CARDINAL PREFECT OF THE S. CONGREGATION “DE NEGOTIIS EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM,” IN WHICH HE ANNOUNCES THE ORDER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII. TO TRANSMIT THE FOLLOWING DECREE TO THE BISHOPS.

Perillustris ac Rñe Domine uti Frater.

De mandato SSñi D. N. Leonis PP. XIII. praesentibus litteris adnexum transmitto Amplitudini Tuae Decretum, iussu eiusdem Sanctitatis Suae ab hac Sacra Congregatione Negociis et Consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita nuper latum, quo manifestatio conscientiae, quocumque nomine veniat, omnino prohibetur, tum pro Monasteriis Monialium, etiam Votorum solemnium, tum pro Institutis Votorum Simplicium utriusque Sexus, iis dumtaxat virorum Institutis exceptis natura ac regimine prorsus Ecclesiasticis.

Declarationes insuper et dispositiones dantur de moderatione communionum, et de confessariis extraordinariis facilius concedendis.

Ad hoc autem Sanctitas Sua Mihi commisit Amplitudini

Tuae, uti Metropolitae, praefatum Decretum transmittendum, ut illius exemplaria cum Episcopis ab eadem Amplitudine Tua dependentibus communicare curet ; qui vicissim cum singulis Superioribus ac Superiorissis Monasteriorum piarumque Domo- rum respectivarum Dioecesum, eiusdem Decreti exemplaria communicent.

Praecipit denique Sanctitas Sua omnibus Locorum Ordinariis ut enunciati Decreti plenam exequutionem sedulo diligenterque vigilare et procurare non intermittant, etiam vi specialis Apostolicae Sedis delegationis.

Haec erant a Me significanda atque declaranda Amplitudini Tuae, cui omnia fausta deprecor a Domino.

Romae die 20 Januarii 1891.

Amplitudinis Tuae
Addictissimus uti frater

I. CARDINALIS VERGA, *Praefectus*.

✠ FR. ALOISIUS EPISCOPUS CALLINICEN, *Secretarius*.

Archiepiscopo.

LITTERAE SSMI. D. N. LEONIS PP. XIII. QUIBUS MANIFESTATIO CONSCIENTIAE PROHIBETUR TUM PRO MONASTERIIS MONIALIUM, ETIAM VOTORUM SOLEMNIUM, TUM PRO INSTITUTIS VOLORUM SIMPLICIUM UTRIVSQUE SEXUS, IIS DUNTAXAT VIRORUM INSTITUTIS EXCEPTIS NATURA AC REGIMINE PRORSUS ECCLESIASTICIS.

DECLARATIONES INSUPER ET DISPOSITIONES DANTUR DE MODERATIONE COMMUNIONUM, ET DE CONFESSARIIS EXTRAORDINARIIS FACILIS CONCEDENDIS.

DECRETUM.

Quemadmodum omnium rerum humanarum quantumvis honestae sanctaeque in se sint ; ita et legum sapienter conditarum ea conditio est, ut ab hominibus ad impropria et aliena ex abusu traduci ac pertrahi valeant ; ac propterea quandoque fit, ut intentum a legislatoribus finem haud amplius assequantur ; imo et aliquando, ut contrarium sortiantur effectum.

Idque dolendum vel maxime est obtigisse quoad leges plurium Congregationum, Societatum aut Institutorum sive mulierum quae vota simplicia aut solemnia nuncupant, sive virorum pro-

fessione ac regimine penitus laicorum; quandoquidem aliquoties in illorum Constitutionibus conscientiae manifestatio permissa fuerat, ut facilius alumni arduam perfectionis viam ab expertis Superioribus [in dubiis addiscerent; e contra a nonnullis ex his intima conscientiae scrutatio, quae unice Sacramento Poenitentiae reservata est, inducta fuit. Itidem in Constitutionibus ad tramitem SS. Canonum praescriptum fuit, ut Sacramentalis Confessio in huiusmodi Communitatibus fieret respectivis Confessariis ordinariis et extraordinariis; aliunde Superiorum arbitrium eo usque devenit, ut subditis aliquem extraordinarium Confessarium denegaverint, etiam in casu quo, ut propriae conscientiae consulerent, eo valde indigebant. Indita denique eis fuit discretionis ac prudentiae norma ut suos subditos rite recteque quoad peculiare poenitentias ac alia pietatis opera dirigerent; sed et haec per abusionem extensa in id etiam extitit, ut eis ad Sacram Synaxim accedere vel pro lubitu permiserint, vel omnino interdum prohibuerint. Hinc factum est, ut huiusmodi dispositiones, quae ad spiritualem alumnorum profectum et ad unitatis pacem et concordiam in Communitatibus servandam fovendamque salutariter ac sapienter constitutae iam fuerant, haud raro in animarum discrimen, in conscientiarum anxietatem, ac insuper in externae pacis turbationem versae fuerint, ceu subditorum recursus et querimoniae passim ad S. Sedem interiectae evidentissime comprobant.

Quare SS^{us} D. N. Leo divina providentia Papa XIII, pro ea qua praestat erga lectissimam hanc sui gregis portionem peculiari sollicitudine, in Audientia habita a me Cardinali Praefecto S. Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium negotiis et consultationibus praepositae die decimaquarta Decembris 1890 omnibus sedulo diligenterque perpensis, haec quae sequuntur voluit, constituit atque decrevit.

I. Sanctitas Sua irritat, abrogat, et nullius in posterum roboris declarat quascumque dispositiones Constitutionum, piarum Societatum, Institutorum mulierum sive votorum simplicium sive solemnium, nec non virorum omnimode laicorum, etsi dictae Constitutiones approbationem ab Apostolica Sede retulerint in forma quacumque etiam quam aiunt specialissimam, in eo scilicet, quod cordis et conscientiae intimam manifestationem quovis modo ac nomine respiciunt. Ita propterea serio iniungi Moderatoribus ac Moderatricibus huiusmodi Institutorum, Congregationum, ac Societatum ut ex propriis Constitutionibus,

Directoriiis ac Manualibus praefatae dispositiones omnino deleantur penitusque expungantur. Irritat pariter ac delet quoslibet ea de re usus et consuetudines etiam immemorabiles.

II. Districte insuper prohibet memoratis Superioribus ac Superiorissis cuiuscumque gradus et praeeminentiae sint ne personas sibi subditas inducere pertentent directe aut indirecte, praecepto, consilio, timore, minis, aut blanditiis ad huiusmodi manifestationem conscientiae sibi peragendam; subditisque e converso praecipit, ut Superioribus maioribus denuncient Superiores minores, qui eos ad id inducere audeant; et si agatur de Moderatore vel Moderatrice Generali denunciatio huic S. Congregationi ab iis fieri debeat.

III. Hoc autem minime impedit quominus subditi libere ac ultro aperire suum animum Superioribus valeant ad effectum ab illorum prudentia in dubiis ac anxietatibus consilium et directionem obtinendi pro virtutum acquisitione ac perfectionis progressu.

IV. Praeterea firmo remanente quoad Confessarios ordinarios et extraordinarios Communitatum quod a Sacrosancto Concilio Tridentino praescribitur in *Sess. 25 Cap. 10 de Regul. et a S. M. Benedicti XIV* statuitur in Constitutione quae incipit "Pastoralis curae" Sanctitas Sua Praesules Superioresque admonet ne extraordinarium denegent subditis Confessarium quoties ut propriae conscientiae consulant ad id subditi adiguatur, quin iidem superiores ullo modo petitionis rationem inquirent, aut aegre id ferre demonstrent. Ac ne evanida tam provida dispositio fiat, Ordinarios exhortatur, ut in locis propriae Dioeceseos, in quibus Mulierum Communitates existunt, idoneos Sacerdotes facultatibus instructos designent, ad quos pro Sacramento poenitentiae recurrere eae facile queant.

V. Quod vero attinet ad permissionem vel prohibitionem ad sacram Synaxim accedendi Eadem Sanctitas Sua decernit, huiusmodi permissiones vel prohibitiones dumtaxat ad Confessarium ordinarium vel extraordinarium spectare, quin Superiores ullam habeant auctoritatem hac in re sese ingerendi, excepto casu quo aliquis ex eorum subditis post ultimam Sacramentalem Confessionem Communitati scandalo fuerit, aut gravem externam culpam patnaverit, donec ad Poenitentiae sacramentum denuo accesserit.

VI. Monentur hinc omnes, ut ad Sacram Synaxim curent diligenter se praeparare et accedere diebus in propriis regulis statutis; et quoties ob fervorem et spiritualem alicuius profectum

Confessarius expedire iudicaverit ut frequentius accedat, id ei ab ipso Confessario permitti poterit. Verum qui licentiam a Confessario obtinuerit frequentioris ac etiam quotidianae Communionis, de hoc certiore reddere Superiorem teneatur; quod si hic iustas gravesque causas se habere reputet contra frequentiores huiusmodi Communiones, eas Confessario manifestare teneatur, cuius iudicio acquiescendum omnino erit.

VII. Eadem Sanctitas Sua insuper mandat omnibus et singulis Superioribus Generalibus, Provincialibus et Localibus Institutum de quibus supra sive virorum sive mulierum ut studiose accurateque huius Decreti dispositiones observent sub poenis contra Superiores Apostolicae Sedis mandata violantes ipso facto incurrendis.

VIII. Denique mandat, ut praesentis Decreti exemplaria in vernaculum sermonem versa inserantur Constitutionibus praedictorum piorum Institutum, et saltem semel in anno, stato tempore in unaquaque Domo, sive in publica mensa, sive in Capitulo ad hoc specialiter convocato alta et intelligibili voce legantur.

Et ita Sanctitas Sua constituit atque decrevit, contrariis quibuscumque etiam speciali et individua mentione dignis minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria memoratae S. Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium die 17 Decembris 1890.

I. CARDINALIS VERGA, *Praefectus*.

✠ FR. ALOISIUS EPISCOPUS CALLINICEN, *Secretarius*.

Notices of Books.

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY. By Paul Schantz, D.D., D.Ph., Professor of Theology in the University of Tübingen. Translated by Rev. Michael F. Glancey, Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Birmingham, and Rev. Victor J. Schobel, D.D., Professor of Theology at St. Mary's, Oscott. In Three Vols. Vol. I., "God and Nature." Dublin, 1891.

THIS is a most opportune and useful work. A quarter of a century ago, the work of the Catholic theologian mainly con-

sisted in battling with the *progenies superarum* bequeathed to us by the so-called Reformation—the Rule of Faith, Justification, Fundamental Articles, Real Presence, Transubstantiation—these were the subject-matter of controversy. Now, however, nearly all this is changed. Protestantism, as a disputant, is completely paralyzed; has disappeared from the field; and a new enemy, a formidable one, a hydra-headed monster, has arisen to test the prowess of the defenders of revealed truth. The new enemy gets the name of Modern Science—an aggregate of *isms* sought out in every department of science, and of *nescience*, to be used against divine revelation. Some of the theories advanced under the name of science are, no doubt, too absurd to need serious refutation. But others of them present grave difficulties, which the Catholic theologian must be prepared to meet, if he would avert serious spiritual danger from those who look to him for guidance. A great part of our current literature is devoted to discussions on the relations of faith and science, and learned men who have no faith, as well as ignorant men who want to pass for scholars, conduct the discussions in a spirit decidedly hostile to revelation. Hence the danger to faith is everywhere present, and must in the interest of souls be effectually met. In such circumstances, as the translators of the above-named work truly say, “there is needed a standard work of reference dealing systematically with scientific questions from a Catholic standpoint.” We fully agree with the translators, Dr. Schobel and Father Glancey, that in translating this work, they have met “a pressing need;” and, in doing so, they have done signal service to all English-speaking Catholics. And they have done their work admirably; in fact, so well, that no one reading the book would take it to be a translation at all. An awkward translation is easily detected, and is always heavy reading. But here we have all the freshness of an original work; here we have expressed, with scrupulous accuracy, the sense of the original, in pure, idiomatic English, in a style that is lucid and forcible, showing that the author is specially fortunate in his translators, who are perfect masters of the languages with which they had to deal.

The author, Dr. Schantz, is Professor of Theology at Tübingen, a theologian of European fame, and of unquestioned orthodoxy. That he is a profound scholar and an accurate close reasoner, is abundantly proved by the work before us. The work is to be in

three volumes. The first one refers to the natural sciences. The translators tell us that the second volume deals "with the comparative science of religion, and with the main issues raised by Biblical criticism. The third is an apologetic treatise on the Church." This is an extensive and most important programme ; and the first volume, now before us, shows the style in which the programme is carried out. In the second chapter we have a most interesting sketch of the vagaries of error from the first age of Christianity down to our time. From the Gnostics and Manicheans, the foes of revelation, are traced along down to Strauss, and Voght, and Rénan, and Darwin. And so, too, from St. Justin to the present day, are the names and works of the defenders of revelation sketched. The chapters contain an interesting amount of information.

Within the limits of a notice like this, it would be impossible to give, and unfair to attempt to give, a fair idea of the worth of a work like this. We can do little more than indicate the principal chapters, and record our conviction that one and all they will amply repay careful perusal. In the chapter on "Religion and History" the author deals effectually with Sir John Lubbock's assertion, that the religious feeling is not universal, and he adduces a chain of most interesting facts to prove his own contention. In the chapter on "Life," and "The Various Forms of Life," the different theories, ancient and modern, on the subject are discussed. Evidently the author feels—as indeed any intelligent defender of revelation must feel—that Darwinism, in some shape or other, is the real enemy ; and, accordingly, he gives a searching and able criticism of that theory. Here he shows a master knowledge of his subject, and a logical acumen that entitles him to a place in the front rank among Catholic apologists.

In the chapter on "Man and the Soul," the author has to meet the whole force of modern rationalism, and he does so in a manner that must satisfy any unprejudiced reader that reason and logic are on his side. The chapters on "Creation," "The System of the Universe," "The Unity of the Human Race," "The Deluge," are, like all the rest of the volume, excellent and most interesting ; and, throughout, the reader cannot fail to be struck by the vast amount of knowledge displayed by the author, as well as by the closeness and accuracy of his reasoning. In treating of modern scientific facts and theories, he is quite at home. He is

invariably kindly disposed—liberal towards science. Some, we venture to say, will think that he is too liberal to science in his treatment of those concluding chapters. Into these chapters Scripture interpretation very largely enters, and extreme caution is necessary in applying the principles he lays down. It would, however, be unfair to the author to pronounce upon the principles of “Biblical Criticism” until the publication of the second volume, in which, as we see from the preface, that subject is to be treated. But, we think, no one can quarrel with the following, which seems to be the key to his system of dealing with the relations of Scripture and science, and which we give from the note of the translators as preferable to the text:—“Only those results of natural science which are *undoubted* and *certain*, are a canon for interpreting Scripture. They *alone* justify a departure from the obvious, literal, and traditional meaning.” This volume is, on the whole, a powerful defence of Theism; and the cosmological argument which is continued through the consecutive chapters acquires irresistible force as it proceeds. The book is a mine of useful, and for our time, necessary information; and English-speaking Catholics have cause to be grateful to the translators for presenting it to them in so attractive an English dress.

J. M.

SUMMA APOLOGETICA DE ECCLESIA CATHOLICA AD MENTEM
AND THOMAE AQUINATIS. Auctore: Fr. J. V. Groot,
Ord. Praed.

It would be unreasonable to expect that a work of two small volumes should have much additional light to shed on a subject so old as the Church Tract, and already so exhaustively treated by our theologians; judicious condensation of matter; orderly, lucid, and scientific exposition, is as much as we can fairly look for. In this respect Fr. Groot's *Summa Apologetica* will cause neither surprise nor disappointment. It is not a profound or elaborate work; but it is a good book, and useful, sound, scientific, written in lucid, condensed style, and for practical purposes sufficiently comprehensive in its range of matter. We would prefer, however, a fuller exposition of Catholic doctrine in some instances, and also of the opposite heresies. The author has little, for instance, about the views of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and his discussion of arguments and difficulties drawn from Scripture, though solid and clear, is wanting in that completeness and

force which distinguish Dr. Murray's treatment of the same questions.

In addition to the ordinary questions of the Church Tract, the author has some very good chapters on Scripture, tradition, the authority of theologians, the relations of faith and reason, &c. In all these questions, and indeed throughout, Fr. Groot has compiled his *Summa* with a judgment and clearness so as to make it a really good Church tract.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. By the Very Rev. M. F. Howley, D.D. London: Burns & Oates. Boston: Doyle & Whittle, Publishers.

DR. HOWLEY has rendered good service to students of Church history in general, and to the members of the Church of Newfoundland in particular, by the compilation of this volume of ecclesiastical history. The Catholic Church, true to the spirit of her calling, has at all times displayed the active spirit of missionary enterprise; and hence, whenever we find new lands discovered, that open out their treasures in return for the blessings of civilization, we invariably find these zealous missionaries of the Gospel, bearing aloft the Cross of Christ, and preaching the saving truths of their holy religion. So has it been in the case of Newfoundland.

The period at which this history commences dates back to the end of the thirteenth century, when, as the author expresses it, "the grand transformation scene in the world's drama was enacted;" when romance gave place to utilitarianism. Glancing slightly at contemporaneous history, the author proceeds to give an interesting account of the pre-Columbian adventures, throws new light on the voyages and character of Columbus himself, and refers briefly to the achievements of his successors in the path of discovery. Though we have no explicit mention of the fact, yet we may reasonably assume that Cabot, who discovered the country in 1497, brought Catholic missionaries in his train, as the names bestowed on the places discovered sufficiently attest the religious spirit of its first visitants from the Old World. Until the year 1583 we can learn little of the religious condition of the country; but in this year the English Protestant colonists arrived, bringing with them the spirit of civil and religious intolerance which characterised their relations with the natives and with the Catholics of the island for many subsequent centuries. In describing the course of events, the author is enabled

to repel many of the calumnies most frequently uttered against the Catholic Church, and to retort with effect on the total neglect of English Protestant governments to provide for the spiritual wants of the aboriginal inhabitants. The gradual rise, spread and development of the infant Church of Newfoundland is clearly set before us, and Ireland has here, indeed, cause for rejoicing, as having most largely contributed by the number, zeal, and energy of her missionaries, towards raising the Church in this remote island to its present high position; for it was owing to the faith and numbers of Irish exiles that religion was here kept alive in the dark epochs of relentless persecution.

From the appointment of Dr. O'Donel, first Vicar-Apostolic and Bishop of Newfoundland, in 1784, the Church of this country has taken her place among the Churches of Christianity, and her history has become comparatively modern. The chief events of importance since then, such as the introduction of the Presentation Nuns in 1833, and of the Mercy Nuns in 1842, the erection of the Cathedral, and the grant of a local legislature, with the other facts of history down to the year 1850, are set before us in a manner that cannot fail to please and interest us.

To set about the compilation of such a work was no easy task: it was necessary to collect an immense amount of matter, documentary and otherwise; while the exercise of prudent judgment was required, to select or reject what was relevant or irrelevant to the author's purpose. Such a book cannot fail to be interesting to the Catholics of Newfoundland—cannot fail to inspire them with even higher hopes for the future of their Church. We congratulate the very reverend author on the success which has attended his praiseworthy efforts; and while we believe that his work must prove to be of absorbing interest to his countrymen, we commend it to all who wish to see the rise and development of the Catholic Church under the most trying circumstances, and her capacity of self-adaptation to the exigencies and conditions of every race and clime.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE MAZDAYASNIAN RELIGION UNDER THE SASSANIDS. Translated from the French of L. C. Casartelli. By Firoz Jamaspji Dastur Jamasp Asa. Bombay: Jehanger Bejanji Karani. 1889.

From the time of Alexander the Great, the Persians had been kept in bondage, but they revolted about 226 A.D., and re-

established their kingdom under Artaxerxes, whose descendants, called the Sassanidae, ruled over Persia for more than four hundred years. Mazdeism, which had decayed under Alexander, became now the State religion. Attention was directed anew to the Avesta. The heresies of Mani and Mazdak sprung up and had to be combated; and, as a result, the Mazdayasnian philosophy, unlike any Oriental system at an earlier date, commenced to receive a scientific form. There were many works written during this epoch, but the writer of this review abstains from citing them out of compassion for these readers who may think that their patience has already been sufficiently taxed with unpronounceable proper names.

Dr. Casartelli, the author of *La Philosophie Religieuse du Mazdeisme sous les Sassanides*, was eminently fitted for his task. He studied the Iranian languages in the University of Lourni, under the famous Professor de Hartz. In 1884 he obtained from the University the degree of Doctor in Oriental Literature. Besides the works under review, he is the author of many learned Essays on kindred subjects in *Le Mison* and the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*. The translator has received Dr. Casartelli's warmest commendations, and is in every way worthy of the original.

T. E. J.

PLAIN SERMONS ON THE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By the Rev. R. D. Browne. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company.

To be obliged to speak unfavourably of any work written by a Catholic priest would be painful to us, no matter in what language the author might write, or what might be the subject of his work. But doubly painful does this duty become when the author writes in our own language, and addresses himself to a subject of which the Continental divines have been hitherto supposed to possess a monopoly. Of sermons originally written in English we have but a small collection when compared with our goodly store of volumes translated from the chief European languages, and with the immeasurably greater number of volumes in these languages still untranslated. If we must have sermon-books at all, it is much better they should be written for us in English, and by men who are conversant with our peculiar characteristics, and

our most pressing wants. Hence we should be anxious to encourage such of our priests—especially of our missionary priests—who possess abilities for the undertaking, to assist their less gifted brethren by putting into their hands solid, practical instructions composed with a view to the requirements of our people. Hence, too, the pain we feel at being obliged to animadvert severely on what we must regard as, at least, a well-intentioned effort to supply the want we mentioned. But, on the other hand, the duty we owe to the clerical readers of the I. E. RECORD forbids us to recommend these *Plain Sermons* as a treasury whence they may draw “new things and old” for the instruction of their people, whereas they are at best but an empty chest, in the crevices of which a poisonous rust has gathered.

To justify the latter part of this metaphor it is sufficient to point out that the quotations from Sacred Scripture throughout this book, whether as texts at the beginning or as illustrations and proofs in the body of the sermons, are almost invariably from the Protestant Authorised Version. The first explanation that occurred to us of this unparalleled audacity on the part of one writing presumably for Catholic priests, or, it may be, speaking to Catholic laymen, was, that the author of these sermons was unaware of the existence of any other English version of the Bible. But, on closer examination, we found it impossible to give him the benefit of even this motive. For when citing those Deutero-Canonical books, which the Protestants reject as uninspired, he does so according to the Catholic version known as *the Douay*, which he also honours by giving its words in certain texts in which the framer of the Authorised Version twisted the meaning of the original to suit their own peculiar errors. Either, then, the Author is acquainted with the discipline of the Church regarding the reading of the Scriptures *in lingua vulgari*, or he is not. If he is not, what right has he to pose as a teacher of the “fundamental truths of the Catholic Church”? And if, being aware of it, he not only violates it himself, but by his action publicly recommends others to violate it, then the fewer his followers the better for the interests of the Church.

In his defence it may be urged that he does not regard the fourth rule of the Index as imposing a strict obligation in these countries, or that he had the required dispensation for using

versions of Sacred Scripture made by heretics. To these arguments we reply that it is no concern of ours how he justifies his own private use of a prohibited version. Had he confined himself to the comparatively harmless exercise of reading his favourite version in private, he might have continued undisturbed to the end of his life to enjoy the pleasures he finds in it. But when through the medium of the pulpit and the press he implicitly teaches others that a version of the Bible condemned by the Church is to be preferred to one at least tacitly approved by the Church, then he must be made to give a stronger reason for his action than an ill-founded private opinion, or a dispensation that does not even touch the case. The only possible reason that can be urged in favour of the Authorised over the Douay version of the Bible is that the language of the former is more idiomatic and more polished than that of the latter. But a glance at our author's own style must convince anyone that this reason could not have influenced his selection.

Apart from this fatal defect, what is to be said of the sermons themselves? Our reply to this question may be expressed briefly thus: the bulk of them are not sermons at all. "Scripture Lessons" would be a more appropriate title for many of them than "Sermons." One would search in vain, we think, among the homilies of the Fathers, or the sermons of our great modern preachers, for a continuous extract from the Bible extending to twenty verses and upwards. Yet such extracts are not uncommon in these "Sermons." One of them, which we have taken the trouble of examining, consists in all of eight pages, and of these fully *five* are made up of extracts from the Bible, one of which covers two whole pages! Now, let us not be taken as objecting to the plentiful use of Scripture in sermons. On the contrary, we know that an appropriate text of Scripture, or an apt illustration borrowed from sacred history, is more appreciated by our people than the most eloquent words or expressive figures drawn from any other source. But then the preacher must *apply* Scripture, must point out its true meaning, and its bearing on the particular subject in hand, and not weary his hearers' minds by treating them to a quotation which takes five minutes to repeat, and which from the very nature of the case cannot all have a direct bearing on the subject of the discourse.

There are many other things about these "Sermons" to which we might legitimately take exception, such as the repetition

again and again in different sermons of the same idea clothed in almost the same words. But we shall pass them over in silence, having already, we think, more than justified the severity with which we have felt obliged to speak of this extraordinary production.

OIRÉ CLAINNE TUIREANN. THE FATE OF THE CHILDREN OF TUIREANN. Edited by R. J. O'Duffy. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. Two Shillings.

THE Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language should get every credit for its practical endeavours to justify its title by publishing at a low cost so many of our old Gaelic classics. Its patriotic labours will confer a priceless boon on the many young scholars now learning Irish; for without such handy texts an acquaintance with the works of our past poets and sages would be impossible, except to the few fortunate enough to have access to the rare and costly prints in which alone they could hitherto be found. Even scholars reading our middle Irish remains with ease will find the pleasure of perusal vastly enhanced by a change from the time-discoloured and tattered folios of a MS., with its cramped writing and arbitrary contractions, to the bright page and cheery type of our modern printed books. The OIRÉ CLAINNE TUIREANN is a volume added to our increasing stock of available Irish books brought out in the effective plan of the Society's other publications, with text, translation, editorial annotations, and a vocabulary. Unfortunately, however, many of the faults apparent in them are represented in this volume also; faults trivial enough in themselves, it may be urged, but of the very gravest concern when there is question of stamping wrong ideas on a material so tenacious of first impressions, and so helplessly passive in our hands, as the minds of young children.

These faults, being errors and oversights on delicate points of textual and grammatical criticism, we shall pass over here, because as the text itself is practically accurate (thanks to the labours of Eugene O'Curry), a tedious discussion of the results of defective editing would seem to impart to them a degree of importance beyond their real magnitude, but especially because they have been treated already and corrected by a more competent authority. It is, indeed, to be regretted that, by its priority of publication, it was impossible that this book could feel the influence of Mr. R. Atkinson's masterly unravelment of familiar

Irish grammar, cruxes as lucidly set forth in those precious appendices of his to Dr. Geoffrey Keating's *Uí bíol-ḡaoirte an bÁir*. A fact, too, that surprised us was the statement made in the editor's preface, to the effect that he had made an 1820 MS. the basis of his recension, and that the extensive treasures of the Academy library contained no more trustworthy exemplar of one of that great triad of national tales, "the three sorrows of story-telling," than those provided by Casey and O'Langan. In the last days of Irish literature our scribes, possessed only of a certain mechanical dexterity in the matter of copying, and but imperfectly understanding the texts from which they wrote, considered it quite within the limits of decorum to tamper unreservedly with their originals in order to reduce their redactions to the vernacular normal of their own day. They preferred that rhetoricians should chide rather than that the people should not understand. In those pre-critical times the scribes were to themselves irresponsible legislators in things grammatical; they were able to read, and if anybody else presumed to question their proficiency, a high-sounding alliterative "run," taken cheaply from Keating or anywhere, and flippantly delivered, satisfied his unlettered auditory of the genuineness of the scribe's claims to a profound knowledge of very hard Irish, indeed. Hence, while disdaining all intention of disparaging the conscientious labours of our late scribes, prosecuted as they were under a set of circumstances and distresses the most hopeless, we still feel bound to say that in the preparation of an exact text for school use we should diligently collate all the copies or fragments of copies made before the national language and literature fell exclusively under the care of such incompetent custodians; or, failing such, to treat yields from MSS. less than—say a hundred and fifty years old, with a judicious amount of salutary prejudice.

R. H.

MARY IN THE EPISTLES; OR THE IMPLICIT TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES CONCERNING THE BLESSED VIRGIN, CONTAINED IN THEIR WRITINGS.—Illustrated from the Fathers and other authors, with introductory Chapters by Rev. Thomas Livius, C.S.S.R. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Catholic Publication Society Company.

WE have no hesitation in saying at once that we welcome this little work. It is calculated to do much good. Any fair-minded

Protestant who reads it, must, we think, be convinced that the comparative silence of Sacred Scripture regarding devotion to the Blessed Virgin is no indication that the devotion was unknown to the Apostles, still less that it is forbidden to us.

Father Livius points out briefly and clearly the true nature of the divine economy in the propagation of the doctrines of faith. "The sacred writers of the books of the New Testament," he says, "had no intention of giving, in their several writings, a full account of all the doctrines that belong to the Christian revelation, nor even a summary of the whole faith. This faith was supposed to be already known, at least in its primary and most essential points, by the Christians whom the Apostles addressed in their Epistles. It had been delivered to them by oral teaching. Having thus prepared the reader not to be scandalized at the silence of the Sacred Scriptures on this or any other point of Christian faith or practice, the author proceeds to show that even in the Epistles the silence regarding the Mother of God is by no means absolute, and that even in that portion of Scripture there is much implicit teaching concerning the Blessed Virgin.

Some will, think this portion of the work strained, and we confess that we ourselves like Father Livius better when reconciling us to Mary's absence than when proving her presence in the Epistles. We ought, however, to bear in mind that he speaks only of implicit testimony, and that he goes no further than great authorities have gone before him.

The work contains nearly 300 pages, printed on good paper, and in clear type. We hope it will have a large circulation.

M. R.

CURSUS VITAE SPIRITUALIS. Auctore R. P. D. Carolo Josepho Morotio. Pustet, Ratisbonae.

THERE is no need to insist on the importance of the branch of ascetic theology for priests, to whom is committed the care of souls. Not merely in the cloister or convent, but in the world, too, are to be found very many highly-favoured souls, and it is the duty of the confessor to guide and help such along the way to perfection. Moreover, the confessor has to prescribe for other classes of penitents remedies to heal now this fault, and again that. Indeed all this is necessarily included in *Ars artium regimen animarum*, which the priest is called on to practise.

It will then be a welcome announcement to many a priest that a really good book—methodical and solid—on the science of directing souls, is the *Cursus Vitae Spiritualis*, by Rev. Charles Joseph Morotio. This new edition has been revived and brought out by a learned Redemptorist priest.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS. (Editio Sexta.) Auctore Augustino Lehmkuhl, S.J. Herder: Friburgi Brisgoviae.

THE *Moral Theology* of Father Lehmkuhl has been so often noticed in the I. E. RECORD, and is so widely known to theological students, that it is hardly necessary to write of its merits. This is a new and *sixth* edition of the famous manual. Though this latest edition has been submitted to most careful revision by the author, very few changes have been made. There are, however, some, and chiefly in Nos. 474, 843, 848, 852, 924, 925, 999, 1,148 of the first volume; and in Nos. 231, 399, 701, 752, 788, 798b, 818, and 838 of the second volume.

RITUALE ROMANUM. Pustet, Ratisbon.

THIS is a new edition, which has appeared within the year, of Pustet's *Editio Typica* of the Roman Ritual. This typical edition of the Ritual should be on the book-shelf of every priest. It is, indeed, too large to be carried about conveniently by the priest attending sick calls; but it contains so many approved forms of blessing various objects as to make it a valuable book of reference.

DE INSIGNIBUS EPISCOPORUM COMMENTARIA. Pustet, Ratisbon.

THE history and symbolism of the different vestments worn by a bishop are fully explained in this work, by Dr. Peter Joseph Rinaldi-Bucci.

THESAURUS SACERDOTUM. By Father Sebastian, Passionist. Duffy & Co., Dublin.

FATHER SEBASTIAN has done good work for his brother priests in putting into their hands this very useful compilation of prayers and devotions specially suited to them.

This little book contains, for instance, prayers before and after mass; short meditations specially suited to priests; an immense number of litanies, prayers, &c.; documents and formulæ relating to the reception of a convert to the Church, and the many formulæ also for enrolling in the different scapulars and associations. The book is, indeed, true to its title—a *thesaurus sacerdotum valde utilis*.

BOOKS OF PIETY.

Little Gems from Thomas à Kempis (Gill & Son, Dublin) are admirably selected and arranged by Miss Sarah O'Brien for every day in the year. The little book itself is also a perfect gem in the style of its bringing out, and is so small that it can be carried in a waistcoat pocket without inconvenience.

The Maxims of St. Philip Neri (Gill & Son, Dublin) will be welcome to all who have read the life of the genial and lovable saint.

The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel (Gill & Son, Dublin) is a compilation from the large work of Monsignor George F. Dillon, and contains, in a small neat volume, the chief facts that are likely to have most interest for the clients of the Virgin Mother of Good Counsel.

The First Communicant's Manual, by Father Gallery, S.J. (Gill & Son, Dublin), was prepared by him for his class of young communicants in Clongowes Wood College, and this fact alone is sufficient to recommend it to every household where children are preparing for the great act of religion which makes the day of First Communion the greatest day of life. We feel assured, moreover, that those who use this little book in preparing for First Communion are likely to continue to use it as a Communion manual through life.

Golden Sands (Benziger Bros., New York).—Very many are deeply indebted to the talent and zeal of Miss Ella M'Mahon. We have before us three of her useful books. *Golden Sands or Little Counsels for the Sanctification and Happiness of Daily Life*, which is from her pen, is the little book of which Pope Pius IX. is reported to have said that he loved these little messengers of God; that one of them sometimes did more for him than a missionary. This is what everyone feels who is in the habit of using daily the collection of *Golden Sands*.

The Art of Profiting by our Faults (Benziger Bros., New York) is another translation from the French, by the same author. The original treatise is by a missionary of St. Francis de Sales, and is in full accord with the spirit of the saint. The book is one which most of us are sure to like, for it is consoling, encouraging, and practical.

The third volume of *The Book of the Professed* (Benziger Bros., New York) is also the fruit of Miss M'Mahon's zeal. This volume

deals very fully with the obligation and character of obedience in religious institutions and of prayer, and certainly contains many useful hints and helps to make the yoke of Christ, to which religious submit themselves, sweet, and His burden light.

The Twelve Virtues of a Good Teacher, for mothers, instructors, and all charged with the education of girls, by Rev. Pattiser, S.J. (Benziger Bros., New York), contains many useful suggestions for all connected with the teaching of children.

Not only teachers, but the public generally would find much enlightenment, as to the respective rights and duties of the State and the Church, and of parents in regard to the education of children from a perusal of another book on education, namely, *Rights of our Little Ones, or First Principles on Education*, by Rev. James Conway, S.J. (Benziger Bros.)

The Crown of Thorns, or the Little Breviary of the Holy Face, is a complete manual of devotion and reparation to the holy face of our Divine Lord. The work appears most suitably at the present time, when we see a widespread devotion towards our blessed Saviour, under the form of devotion to the Holy Face growing up in every country, and particularly in Ireland.

We should wish to see the little book entitled *The Catholic Young of the Present Day*, widely circulated among our young men's associations of all kinds. It is a word of important advice, in the form of a series of letters addressed by the Bishop of St. Gall to the young men of his diocese. He reveals in these beautiful letters the dangers and difficulties before them; instructs them as to the way of avoiding or overcoming these obstacles; and finally, points out how easy it is to practise virtue, which is shown to be the only sure way to happiness.

THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JUNE, 1891.

SOME CAUSES OF ANGLICAN SECESSION.

THE reasons which influence members of the Establishment, who, one by one, are led to submit themselves to the authority and teaching of the Catholic Church, are various and dissimilar. They are nearly as dissimilar and various from each other as the individuality of those persons of independent thought, of strong will, and of consistent action, who elect to make their humble submission. The submission of each Anglican, in turn, has been preceded by a period, more or less prolonged, and by a conflict, more or less severe, of religious doubt. By the term "religious doubt" is meant that mental position, of partial ignorance, and of partial knowledge in divine things, which, once fully realized, almost of necessity leads to secession from the Church of England. And the same law which obtains at the present day, has been observed to hold good in the noteworthy and numerous conversions that have continued to flow in a perennial stream, during the last fifty years, from Protestantism to Catholicity. Indeed, the like may be said of the stream of dissentients, or separatists, which has emerged from the Anglican body with a variable volume, in every succeeding year of the same period. In the matter of personal conversion, whether on theoretical or on practical grounds, there is a range of opinion divergent from the Established Religion, as well as a range of belief converging to the Church of Rome, which, to say the least, is wide and

far-reaching. There are—account for them as you may—difficulties and uncertainties repellant from the one, as well as certitudes and privileges—minimize them as you will—attractive towards the other, which are self-contained, adequate for their purpose, and beyond the range of controversy or of disproof. Hence, it is almost impossible to find any two converts, being educated and intelligent Anglicans, at the same date, and still more, any two converts at different dates, who, acting without concert with each other—and such confidences are seldom at the time reciprocated—concur in the details of their reasons for making the all-important change of religion. It is quite impossible to find them, supposing that, at a given date, no public or specially disturbing influence, ecclesiastical or secular, has arisen—euphemistically called in the Establishment “a grave crisis”—which shakes the trembling allegiance of Anglicans in their own system. It is impossible to find them, if no such crisis exists, which drives men and women headlong by units, be they in tens or in hundreds; or which affects them to any extent gregariously, in larger or smaller numbers, to follow their leaders out of the bare wastes of the “Anglican paddock” into the fertile and pleasant pastures of the Roman fold.

At such, or at the like times of more than ordinary religious excitement—for minor Anglican crises recur, or used to recur, and probably still recur, about every other year—it is true, that common dangers and evils are suggestive of common arguments; and that common hopes and fears produce common action. At these times, indeed, there will be found embedded deep in the minds of all who live under the present influence of Protestant doubt, a general and hearty disagreement with their actual past; and a general, but intense predilection for a possible, anticipated future in store for an enfranchised conscience. But, the variety of valid causes which lead different simple-minded, faithful and bold souls from the same starting-point to the same goal, is only equalled by the variety of conditions in the existing theological surroundings of every individual convert. The indirect influences, or accessories of doubt, in

each one's life must be reckoned with and accounted for in the case of each separate conversion to Rome. His early story and later career; his family connections and position in society; his intellectual power, or want of power, and his physical temperament, be it strong or weak; his very sympathies, interests and affections—these are further elements to be noted, which should be carefully weighed. Indeed, these personal details must be estimated, if any rational sequence of cause and effect has to be assigned, which opponents cannot deny, for the only not endless and really unnumbered cases of Catholic recusancy of both sexes and all ages, from every grade and rank of English-speaking persons, during the last half century. Nor must the primary or immediate influences of conversion be taken for granted, or be overlooked, as if these were, or as if these, argumentatively, ought to be similar. As a fact, they are far otherwise. And it is the object of the following pages to indicate, however briefly, some miscellaneous causes of Anglican secession. The mere enumeration of them in outline will indicate not only how various are the objections which may justly be urged against the permanent abiding of any intelligent, thoughtful and pious Anglican in the communion of the Church of England; but also, how large, and almost innumerable, is the number of such valid objections. And their number will afford evidence of a cumulative character, which proves how great, and even overpowering, is the weight of testimony which can be rightly brought against the Established Religion. All these reasons may be attributed, more or less exactly, to that result of partial ignorance and partial knowledge of the principles and practice of our holy faith, which alone the Protestant Church of England can impart, and which we call doubt. One, or other, or more of them—in spite of Anglican answers, which either deliberately or accidentally miss the mark; or of Ritualistic “plain reasons,” which inquiry proves to be anything but “good reasons”—practically, and it may be said logically, have led countless souls out of the Establishment, and still do lead them, where all theological roads lead, to Rome.

I. The first of these reasons for legitimate doubt in Anglicanism, which may be named, is the world-wide question of authority. And the utter absence of all real authority, or even of all pretended authority, for Anglican belief and practice, if not the formally-acknowledged sufficiency of private judgment, as the rule of faith amongst members of the Establishment, is a fertile source of doubt. Numberless instances of this lack of authority might be quoted and discussed. But two widely different cases may suffice. The first of these is the attitude which the Anglican body, in her Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, assumes towards the three ancient creeds of the Catholic Church. That the Establishment is content still to offer these symbols unreformed and intact in spite of a growing dislike to one of them, is a matter of gratulation to Anglicans; but the more logical among them can hardly feel grateful for the principle upon which their spiritual mother offers these symbols for the acceptance of her children. The creeds of Christendom are to be received, says the Church of England, because their several statements may be intellectually proved, necessarily by the disciple himself, to be in accordance with his own personal interpretation of Holy Scripture. Can there be a more explicit appeal to the principle of private judgment, short of employing these terms in a set form of words? The inference is undeniable; if the articles of the creed cannot be proved, in accordance with the stated principle, the Anglican disciple may, *i.e.*, is at liberty, not to accept them. How different is the tone and temper with which the Church Catholic deals with her children. "O my God," she teaches them to pray, in an Act of Faith, "I firmly believe all that Thou hast revealed, and which the Holy Catholic Church proposes to me to be believed, because Thou art truth itself, which can neither deceive, nor be deceived: in this faith I desire to live and die." Can any two systems of belief be more opposed than those which produce the Anglican article of belief and the Catholic form of prayer? The opposition will become the more apparent if a Catholic would attempt to accept the Anglican theory; or, on the other hand, if an Anglican could venture

to use the Catholic devotion. No Catholic would dare to balance his faith on his own proofs of the creeds from the Bible. No Anglican is bold enough to approach Almighty God, and to protest before Him, "I believe all that the Church of England proposes to me to be believed . . . and in this faith I hope to . . . die."

A second reason which causes doubt in the mind of a loyal Anglican in the Catholic instinct of his communion, on the question of authority, is the specious position which Anglicanism takes towards an imaginary form of antiquity, to which it appeals. This form of primitive Christianity was evolved from the inner consciousness of the Reformers, and a theoretic model of what the ancient Church ought to be, was constructed by them in the sixteenth century. Those who rebelled, and who fought against the traditional and universally-accepted outline of the living Church, created for themselves a dead model to which they pretended to yield obedience. The aspect, the character, the proportions, the functions of the model, there is no need to discuss. But by the creation of it by themselves, the Reformers implicitly asserted a right; and in virtue of that right they explicitly claimed a power of appeal from the existing Church to something centuries outside itself. They appealed from a living, visible, tangible organism, with a continuous historical career of sixteen centuries, to the supposititious result of a struggling and embryonic and undeveloped form of Christianity. They appealed to a religious system, the faith and practice of which, on most modern contentious topics, we possess the vaguest information. Indeed, they appealed to that of which, apart from the records of the Church of a thousand years, we historically know next to nothing. And it is these very thousand years of mediæval Christianity which Protestants incontinently, as well as inconsistently, ignore. In the appeal, however, itself, is contained an element of doubt. By looking without its own boundaries; by looking backward from its own era, for ten or twelve centuries; by creating an authority, be it never so shadowy, beyond a presumably God-given power; by pretending submission to a power, itself of questionable reality,

which could neither hear evidence for an appeal, nor decide the merits of an appeal, nor enforce the result of an appeal—the Anglican Reformers, even if unintentionally, yet actually, declared the principle of private judgment in religion. There is no logical escape from this conclusion. And the fact that the Anglican Church so little realizes the notes, characteristics and duties, as well as the privileges of a Church, as voluntarily to abdicate its authority, nominally God-bestowed, in favour of an unreal abstraction, self-created, of thirty generations before—this fact is sufficient to raise, and raising to confirm, a doubt in Anglican minds of the genuineness and authenticity of the claims of the Protestant Church of England.

II. The purely human origin, human history, human existence, and human modes and methods of the communion by courtesy styled the “Church of England,” is another cause of doubt—a cause which, when led to its legitimate result, ends in the assurance of doubtlessness. For instance, to refer only here and now to the legal position at the present moment of the Anglican body. The following may be affirmed to be stern matters of fact, and not matters of opinion. The existence of the Established Religion is dependent solely upon the consent of the English nation, a consent which is dependent, in its turn, on the votes of the English democracy. At the present moment, without question, in continuation of a national tradition of three and a-half centuries, the democracy wills the continuation of the Anglican ecclesiastical anomaly: wills it, inasmuch as no general and serious demand by the constituencies has yet been made for its determination. Secular politicians best know the chances that such a demand will be made, when certain other national and international questions of supreme importance, which now stop the way, have been finally settled. Meantime, the continuance and development of Anglicanism are dependent on the action of the Crown and the law of the land, exercised in endless ways, which are expressive of the consent of the nation. Its government, again, for so long a time as it remains a national religion, is dependent on the will and pleasure of a non-Christian

parliament; it may almost be said, of a parliament that is anti-Christian. And its government is fatally conscious of inconsistencies with its claims, which are sufficient to destroy all known marks of Catholicity. The leader of a temporary majority in the House of Commons absolutely nominates to all the bishopricks of the Establishment, and directly or indirectly, the large majority of its chief clerical office-bearers; whilst the greater number of its parochial clergy are appointed by laymen who are not necessarily, and often are not even nominally, members of the Church of England.

In question of appeals, the same law is apparent—the law of lay or civil supremacy; and this law, accordingly to the party proclivities of the Anglican controversialist, who estimates this side of his position, is admitted with sorrow and humiliation, or is proclaimed with exultation and joy, or is owned with cynical indifference. And the Anglican legal appeals, Anglicans themselves being the judges, are practically decided in virtue of the jurisdiction of the Crown, by secular judges pronouncing lay judgments in civil courts of justice, which, by way of moral compensation to Anglican susceptibilities, are dignified with the titles of the old and genuine ecclesiastical courts. Again: the jurisdiction exercised by the Anglican episcopate lies in close proximity with the principle of the Anglican law of appeals, and even forms portion of it; and this question also affords grave cause for doubt. Whatsoever definition may be given of the term “jurisdiction” itself, and whether the gift or quality described by the definition be a positive or a negative quantity, there appear to be three sources only from whence authority to employ the power of ecclesiastical jurisdiction can proceed. From one of these three sources, viz., from the centre of Christendom, whence for a thousand years came the jurisdiction exercised by the Catholic bishops of the ancient Church of England, the jurisdiction of the Protestant communion certainly cannot now be derived. The jurisdiction, therefore, which the Protestant episcopate at present exercises, must arise from one of the two other sources. It must be—to speak of the last-made English Protestant bishop in terms which are applicable to the English

Protestant bishop who was first made—either self-evolved from the possession, or by the possessor, of the Anglican See ; or it must be simply delegated by the English State. Whether of the two sources are the least un-Catholic, it is needless to discuss. Both lie on one level. History points to the State as the source of Anglican jurisdiction ; and the nature of things forbids the idea that the first Anglican bishop could convey what himself did not possess, namely, ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It is unnecessary to find an escape from the horns of the dilemma. But, it may not be useless to remark, in passing, that the difficulty touching Anglican jurisdiction is entirely distinct from, and is severed by an impassible gulf from, that of Anglican orders. Even if the Protestant Church could prove by documentary evidence, what it is powerless to prove, viz., the Apostolic succession of its ministers from pre-Reformation times, the absence of jurisdiction coming from without (saving that of a civil and secular character, proceeding from the Crown), or the presence of a subjective and self-evolved jurisdiction, created to meet the lack of Catholic power and authority, would justify a doubt of the real position of the religion established by law in England.

III. Another valid and rational cause of doubt in Anglicanism, of primary importance, may be found in the religious position of the Establishment, as distinct both from its legal position, and from all questions of order or of jurisdiction. Doubt clusters around the interpretation of the formularies of the Anglican Communion ; and the extent to which this side of doubt reaches is almost co-terminous with the extent of the formularies themselves. There exist, and always have existed in the Established Religion, since its origin in the sixteenth century, a body of newly-created formularies, both within and without the covers of the Book of Common Prayer. These official documents bear the titles of Article, or Homily, or Canon, or Office, or Order, or Catechism. Their contents are multifarious, and almost defy classification, still more enumeration. Suffice it to say, that they deal with public worship ; with the administration of sacred rites ; with the teaching of

children; with the instruction of the clergy and laity; with the government of the Anglican Church, and with points of faith against which protest is made, as well as with certain dogmas of religion on behalf of which belief is required. The ground covered by these many-sided documents, it is hardly an exaggeration to describe, within their own limits, as universal. History, sacred and profane; theology, dogmatic and moral; the science of liturgiology, in text and rubric; exegesis and translation of both the Old and the New Testaments; canon law, in various branches; controversy, in almost every conceivable aspect—these form but a portion of the miscellaneous contents of the newly-composed formularies of the Anglican Church at its inception. These documents, apart from the Holy Bible, extending over hundreds and hundreds of pages, bristle with thousands of statements more or less truthful, more or less false, more or less a combination of both truth and falsehood, and thus are infected with doubt. Every one of them is supposed to be accepted by the laity, who are loyal to the Anglican Church; and the larger part of them are either imposed upon, or are received upon oath by, the Protestant clergy of the Establishment.

And yet, what is the view which average Anglican laymen and clergymen take of these formularies severally composed for their benefit, or edification, or guidance, or government by their ecclesiastical superiors and teachers at the date of the Reformation? Anglican laymen, as a body, decline to be held responsible for, and simply ignore, large tracts of the Reformation Church literature, and hold themselves free to consider the residue in the light in which their spiritual guides view these documents. And Anglican clergymen view the same, both in the gross and in detail, according to the teaching of the sect or school of thought to which they respectively belong, or to which they yield a temporary obedience. The various statements in the documentary literature of the Church of England, which lend themselves to a variety of interpretations are thus diversely, and in turn, estimated by each of the three dominant parties within the Establishment which vainly strives for the mastery

over the other two. It is useless to indicate any individual statement out of the numberless debatable questions, contained in one formulary alone of the Establishment. But, of almost endless doctrinal positions enunciated in the Articles of Religion, the three several parties take the three following views:—the selected dogma, or fact, or mystery of Christianity is held to be true by the more Catholic-minded Anglican; is pronounced to be false by the more Protestant-minded Evangelical; and is looked upon with supreme indifference by the more Latitudinarian-minded of the Broad Church cleric, or by their lay followers in each case. All Anglican ministers, notwithstanding, more or less *ex animo*, accept and pledge themselves to all and to each of these formularies, as the authorised teaching, and mode of government of their Communion. And their acceptance and solemn pledge constitute the sole legal condition for their receiving the emoluments of the Establishment, for acting the part of its legal representative, and for exercising the privilege of ministering to the nation in its name. Two results come from this laxity in subscribing to, and this facility of escape from, the bondage of the Anglican formularies of belief and conduct. The spirit of *anomia* and disorder, in thought and action, pervades every portion of the Establishment, including the three great parties into which the Church of England is split, and the large minority of nominal Anglicans who subscribe to the peculiar tenets of no recognised party. This discord finds expression in each order, sacred or secular; and, consciously or unconsciously, affects every member from the Anglican bishop downwards, or from the Anglican layman upwards. Whilst, in consequence of this widespread lay and clerical licence, the principles of the Anglican Reformation, by which all members alike are nominally bound, and which all are, or ought to be, equally concerned to hold sacred and to keep supreme, are treated one by one with studied contempt, or with ostentatious disregard, or with ill-placed levity, by each section in turn of the Church of England. These circumstances, and much that may be derived from them by logical inference, furnish fresh cause for honest

doubt in the minds of the more thoughtful adherents of Anglicanism.

IV. But, perhaps the most potent cause of doubt of primary importance to the Anglican, who is neither a Latitudinarian in practice, nor an Evangelical in belief, is found in none of the difficulties already named. To such an one, doubt, *i.e.*, doubt sufficiently strong for conversion, adheres neither in the laxity of themselves or of their neighbours in the matter of subscription to the Articles; nor in the question, half historical, half theological, of Anglican order and of Catholic jurisdiction; nor in the legal and constitutional aspect of the Establishment; nor in its human origin and source; nor in its undeniable want of all legitimate authority. Rather, and so far as each of these conditions of Anglican life can be severed from what really includes them all—namely, Anglican separation from the centre of the Christian religion—the High Churchman becomes consciously shaken in his allegiance when he takes another view of the position of his communion. When he calmly and seriously contemplates the corporate position of the religion established by law in relation to Christianity as a whole, then the mental vision becomes to his soul almost instinct with divine and personal revelation. The position of the Church of England is then seen to be not only insular and peculiar, which it ever appeared to all outsiders; but also, as it then seems to an Anglican when he can take himself out of himself, and see things as they actually are, isolated and abnormal. The isolation is felt to be almost unprecedented; for, not only does Western Christianity, to adopt the insular language of Anglicans, ordain every convert clergyman who aspires to the priesthood in the Catholic Church; but the Eastern Church insists on baptizing any convert layman who seeks to be reconciled with the Communion of the Orthodox Church. In short, the isolation is absolutely unparalleled—unless, indeed, Anglicans are content to be compared with members of a Church avowedly heretical, or of one whose candlestick has been entirely removed, and whose place in the Christian family has vanished from off the face of the earth.

For instance: the Church of England stands outside the recognised pale of organic, traditional, historic Christianity, and of the One Universal Church—whether the Anglican looks for unity in the East or in the West—founded by Christ, and extended by His Apostles. It is disowned by every single body of professing Christians, orthodox or heretical, Catholic or Uniat, which can boast of an historical record of more than three centuries. It is unchurched, in every essential which constitutes a Church, by the main bulk of Christendom—by the residue, if it so pleases the Anglicans to speak of the mighty Mother of all Churches, of the Latin Communion—of which it once formed a portion, perhaps the fairest portion. Neither does the Anglican, saving under the influence of strong mental convictions fully realize the meaning of this universal and absolute repudiation of himself as a member, and of his communion as a branch of Christ's Church. For it means that whether in life or death he has neither part nor lot spiritually with the countless multitude of faithful souls on earth, estimated at some three hundred millions; of faithful priests, who number about three hundred thousand; of faithful bishops, upwards of twelve hundred in number. It means even more than this, with regard to the Church Triumphant: for the Church of England has deliberately severed itself from the whole company of apostles and saints who have evangelized the nations; of the martyrs and confessors, who have suffered for the faith; of the doctors and theologians, who have taught the elect; of the religious, of both sexes, who have sanctified themselves and have become the salt of the earth.

Nor does this isolation of the English Church from both the centre and the circumference of Catholic Christendom exhaust the story of its abnormal existence. Anglicanism, as a system, is unacknowledged by the great Eastern Churches, whether orthodox or heretical, by the Russian Imperial patriarchate, and by schismatical bodies, which had become hoar and venerable in their separation ages and ages before the advent in the kingdom of Christ of that monstrosity in religion—Protestant Christianity. The

modern Church of England, again, is viewed with just suspicion, as being neither wholly Catholic, nor purely Evangelical, but as being a hybrid between two antagonistic and incompatible religions, by the three great Protestant bodies on the Continent—Lutheran, Evangelical, and Calvinistic; and by the three great denominations in England—the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Independents, whose numerical aggregate bears a considerable proportion to the population of the Church of England. It is in full communion only outside the ranks of its own descendants, legitimate or illegitimate, in the Colonies or elsewhere, as the recently-held and so-called Pan-Anglican Synods bear witness—with but a single tiny body of Christians, who can be counted only by tens of thousands, across the Atlantic. And it is not unworthy of remark, that this community, the only body claiming, however unreal, the status and style of a Church with which the Establishment declares itself to hold communion, bears on its title-deeds the honest avowal of being a “Protestant” Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Lastly, as evidence of the isolated and exceptional condition of the Established Church, another fact may be added. Instead of having increased and multiplied in a healthy, natural, and normal manner, under the influence of every adventitious aid and support from the English State, the Anglican body has dwindled, proportionately to its original exclusiveness, or its after-supremacy over the Nonconformist population, to a faint shadow of its former self. It has dwindled from the form and dimensions it assumed, as created by Henry, as re-created by Elizabeth, as restored under Charles, and as once and for long exercising undisputed authority over the entire English nation, over members of the old faith alone excepted. It has dwindled, in spite of, or, more probably, in consequence of, having been the Established and State-protected and civilly-governed religion of the nation; and consequently, of being still patronized by the titled orders, and being still able to command the purse of the wealthy classes, whether upper or middle. And it may well be termed a faint shadow,

inasmuch as, instead of being the spiritual mother of the English people as a whole, whom it had once led or rather forced, into corporate apostacy, it has become the legal ancestress, in direct descent, one or two degrees removed, during nine or ten generations of unrivalled supremacy, of upwards of two hundred different sects of Protestants of more consistent action than itself. Nor does this represent the full decline of the diminished proportions of the Establishment. The Church of England has probably lost the spiritual adherence of from one-half to two-thirds of the adult population of *bonâ fide* Church people of to-day. Indeed, if published statistics be trustworthy, the proportions would be really more in the disfavour of the Established Church. Whilst, if an effort were made to estimate the numbers of those Anglicans who are infected even slightly with Catholic tendencies, and who seek to re-introduce by a side wind to the Establishment, Catholic truth and Catholic worship, the result would prove to be exceedingly small. Perhaps the so-called Ritualists may number about two thousand ministers, or a thirteenth part of the Anglican clergy; and five hundred disciples to each clergyman of this denomination would probably be a very high estimate to allow—a million of followers all told, out of twenty-nine or thirty millions of Englishmen. Those who, after their light and according to their opportunities are more rather than less consistently Catholic in temper, even in their Protestant inconsistency, can be numbered only by, perhaps, a decimal part of these figures—possibly, a couple of hundred of the clergy, and a hundred thousand of their more or less obedient disciples, men and women.

The above causes of legitimate doubt in the position of the Anglican Church, as a claimant to the honour of being a branch of the Church Catholic, are elements, all and severally, in generating the motive power which eventually impels each unit in turn, who is personally called from without the Church to acknowledge the supreme authority of the Holy See. Each cause, as it commends itself to the individual conscience, acts the part of yeast to leaven the whole intelligence of the inquirer. Each cause, as it is accepted with

frankness, and is argued to its legitimate end with honesty, predisposes the soul to accept some other and further cause of doubt. The order and sequence in which each cause commends itself, varies with the temperament, capacity, and circumstances of the victim of doubt. It matters not at all which cause first strikes the conscience, or which cause is the last perceived by the intellect. Neither does it matter which cause may be selected as a foundation upon which to build, or as a point of departure from which to attack afresh, the pretensions of Anglicanism. Where all equally, though by different routes, and at different times, lead the inquirer out of Protestantism into the Church, a positive and direct argument may commend itself to one mind, and a negative and indirect argument may appeal to another, on which to rest the entire case for or against conversion. For instance, the lack of any recognised authority in the Church of England may prove suggestive of the depth and reality of its legal and secular disabilities from a Catholic standpoint. Historical difficulties once substantiated may clear the way for perceiving the want of order and the lack of jurisdiction, or the internal dissensions and differences which convulse the religion established by law. Whilst the absolute isolation in Christendom, and the unique and abnormal position of the Church of England therein, together with its gradual disintegration and yearly-increasing spiritual decrepitude as an organic whole, may bring conviction to the enlightened conscience, that the body presumptuously assuming the characteristics of a Church, of which even this alone may be affirmed, cannot be verily and indeed the immaculate spouse of Christ. Whatever result, however, each cause in its order may tend to produce on the individual soul, they all find a legitimate place in an apology for doubt, which everyone is forced to make, willingly or unwillingly, publicly or in private, to itself or to its God—an apology which is also occasionally offered in self-defence to former friends, or as a suggestive plea for imitation to fellow-workers—before individual submission is made to, and personal admission is humbly sought in, the one true home for all weary, perplexed, and opinion-tossed souls—the holy Roman Church.

These four groups of subjects are specimens of many more. The facts and circumstances they include, here mentioned in general terms only, are suggestive of doubt, more or less perfect, in questions of primary importance, in the Anglican communion. Some of them, perhaps all of them, would bear a more exhaustive discussion and a more detailed treatment; and the larger portion deserve to be pressed upon the consciences and the intellects of Anglicans. It may be inquired, however, wherefore and for what purpose and to what end are they stated anew, or at all, at the present moment. Are they not old, old objections to abiding within the borders of the Anglican Establishment—ask those to whom these arguments are more than familiar? Undoubtedly, it may be replied, they are as old as the Establishment itself: they have a history of three and a-half centuries of chequered life. Have they not been made and answered over and over and over again, in favour of not submitting to the Catholic Church—it may be more reasonably and pertinently asked? Yes, certainly: numberless answers have been given, time out of mind, to these and to similar objections against a frank and loyal adherence to the Protestant Communion. Do not these old answers to old objections suffice to restrain Anglicans for secession to Rome—continues the Protestant inquirer? As certainly and as decidedly—it must be contended by the Catholic apologist, who may now justly join issue on the argument—they do not. These old answers are insufficient to restrain the flow of conversions from the Church of England into the Catholic Church. That they mar the fate of some is undeniable; for, all that are called are not chosen. But conversions to the true faith continue to multiply in spite of them. For there are answers and answers to valid objections. Some answers only raise fresh and stronger objections, and many an answer contains no genuine removal of the objection to which it is a nominal reply. Whilst, so far from age in itself being fatal to the force and completeness of a real objection to Protestantism, the fact that an objection dates contemporaneously with the falsity against which it is

levied, forms a powerful element in its favour. The poison and its antidote have thus marched side by side together ; and the latter certainly is not more weak now than formerly. Indeed, a valid objection to a novelty in religion coeval with the novelty itself improves with age, like sound wine, and years and centuries only increase its potency and flavour. No doubt, the repetition of flat and stale objections is irksome to faithful Catholics, and is displeasing to Protestants unhappily crystalized into schism or heresy. Both, however, have an obvious remedy in their own hands. But, to earnest Catholic minds, and to consistent Protestants, they are not all matters of indifference ; and to some minds old facts with new faces are positively attractive. Indeed, contact with the world, and the friction of every-day life, gradually but surely wears away the surface of controversial truth ; and should any one be able to rehabilitate afresh an ancient valid objection which in its day has done yeoman's service, and to thrust home the argument to the soul of the honest doubter in Protestantism, he will become, after his power, a polemical benefactor.

In any case, it is beneficial for the great cause of the conversion of Protestant England, that old arguments with new illustrations, or with new modes of address, should be reproduced in each succeeding generation. They may at last, by the mere weight of the persevering reiteration of truth, catch some persons who never before were attracted, and convert some who previously had declined to listen to the voice of the divine charmer, charmed he never so wisely. They may, at least, instil a doubt—one honest doubt, honestly followed to its legitimate conclusion, is enough—a doubt into the hearts of those who have never yet been blessed with the rational hope, or even, in some cases, with the intellectual idea, of freedom from the intollerable bonds of private opinion without a governing principle, and of public teaching not based upon divine authority. Neither is such an effort on the one hand, nor is such a result on the other, out of harmony with the genius of Protestantism, whose main note is one of part knowledge and of part ignorance combined. Nay, both are in strict conformity

with its traditions, with its developments, and even with its methods. It is competent, therefore, for a Catholic to walk in such footsteps. And if the effort be made, and the course be followed in good faith, temperately and without a shade of bitterness, in charity withal, and not without a prayer for a measure of success with immortal souls, a certain amount of feebleness of execution may be forgiven for the sake of a good and a pure intention.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

DANTE'S IDEAL OF CHURCH AND EMPIRE.

THE development of Italian national life during the past twenty years is a spectacle which attracts attention, not alone on account of its actual living interest, but also, and to a great extent, on account of its relations to the past. Whilst certain phases of its modern aspect have almost wholly engrossed the minds of Catholics in other parts of the world, the Liberals of Italy have not been backward in endeavouring to justify what is called the "*fait accompli*" by traditional and historic arguments¹ drawn from sources which require to be carefully examined and tested before they can be admitted as legitimate. The *Revolution* was never overburdened with scruples in manufacturing a position for itself any more in the domain of history than in the region of facts. The chief thing with it is once to get a grasp of power, and when that is done all else follows in natural sequence. So far, its adepts hold the upper hand in Italy. For the time being might and violence prevail against right. The work that was plotted in dark places, and fomented by invisible powers, is there upheld by a combination which, from its very nature, is destined to be broken. Human conspiracies founded on a basis of mutual hatred and distrust cannot last; they fall of their own weight, and, as a rule,

¹ *La Tradizione Unitaria in Italia*, by Signor Giuseppe, Fontana.

crush their designers. But, in the interval of momentary triumph, the architects of the new order profess themselves satisfied with their work. According to them the edifice is firmly established. "Italy," they say, "is at last *one, free, independent*; her people are satisfied; her security is assured." Those amongst them who are concerned for the respectability of their position protest that by despoiling the Sovereign Pontiff and appropriating his territory they mean no injury to religion. They simply regard the temporal dominion of the Popes as a danger to their country, and an element of corruption in the Church. This, they maintain, was the life-long belief of some of the greatest of their countrymen. In their efforts to create a decent genealogy for themselves they have ransacked the national annals from end to end, and have grasped at every phantom of approval which their fancy discovered in past ages. In this eager search they respected no memories, were deterred by no methods, however dishonest or unworthy. Not satisfied with the paternity of the boldest speculators of the middle ages, and of the most independent spirits of modern times, they have questioned the memory of some of the noblest and most Christian of their race, and have claimed the approbation of names and of authorities which only recklessness could invoke. The patronage of men like Arnold of Brescia and Giordano Bruno, which nobody will deny them, is not sufficient. These are too unpopular, too repulsive, even for the Liberal taste. Machiavelli is, indeed, brought into requisition, and made to do duty for all he is worth. The keynote of his service is to be found in that last chapter of the *Prince* in which he bewails the sad condition of Italy—"beaten, lacerated, despoiled, a prey to every sort of depredation and rapine," and calls aloud for "some other Moses to redeem the Israelites, for another Cyrus to crush the Medes, another Theseus to recall the dispersed Athenians." But the cunning Florentine is too well known, his name too closely associated with the wiles of statecraft, and with the theory so generally adopted nowadays of "means to an end," to be of much authority when there is merely question of right and justice. It is a principle of expediency to turn

principle to account when it suits the occasion; hence recourse is had to those who were remarkable for their uprightness and integrity that their character may supply for the deficiency of others, and that what stands out most prominently in their lives may be made to shield their own mistakes, or lend somewhat of its splendour to the opinions that are falsely attributed to them. And thus it is that the recent biographers and commentators of Dante have made such desperate efforts to write down one great name, at least, among the patrons of modern Italy.

If these are to be credited, the leading aim and dominant thought of Allighieri was nothing short of the complete destruction of the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. This was the object for which he worked and strove and yearned many a year, and for the final accomplishment of which he composed the immortal trilogy to which "heaven and earth contributed." We are not, of course, placed under any obligation or necessity to exaggerate the opinions of Dante one way or another. Our veneration for him falls very far short of that almost unqualified worship in which some of his admirers indulge. As a practical statesman he was a failure. He was not incapable of weakness, of error, or of sin. He was a victim to the miseries and passions of life, like other mortals, and his ardent nature often led him, in details, at least, beyond the bounds of charity and justice. But much can be forgiven to genius and to faith; and whilst duly noting the prominent shortcomings of his character, we should never leave out of sight his imposing titles to honour and to fame. His poem is a monument of Christianity and of Catholicity that will never die; "a great, supernatural world-cathedral," as Carlyle calls it,¹ "piled up there; stern, solemn, awful." As the chanter of the sublimest truths of morality and of faith that were ever wedded to poetry, we admire and love him; and when his authority is now invoked to shield the despoilers of the Church and to sanction the triumphs of modern revolution, we refuse to take it on the simple saying of those in whom the "wish is father to the thought." We

¹ *Lectures on Heroes,—Dante.*

prefer to examine for ourselves his political plan for the adjustment of the world, and to inquire from him, and from him alone, in what sense, if any, he is opposed to the temporal dominion of the successors of St. Peter.

With the out-and-out disciples of the Foscolos and the Rosettis, who look upon the *Divine Comedy* as the composition of a sectary, having for its aim the total destruction of Catholicism, we have nothing here to do. "*Non ragionam di lor.*" The modern invention of the Shakespearean cryptogram is a much more ingenious discovery than that of the so-called key to the mysterious "gergo" of the fourteenth century. On the candid admission of Dean Church,¹ the effort to rank Dante as the precursor of Wickliffe and Luther has turned out an abject failure. It was chiefly made by some interested Italians who were anxious to truckle to the bigotry of England, but whose nobility of purpose was quickly seen through, and duly discounted.

And, first of all, it will be admitted that the fundamental principle which has been, as it were, the mainspring of the Italian Revolution is diametrically opposed to the principle on which Dante based the whole fabric of his monarchy. For the ground on which Italian Liberals have taken their stand is this—that the final judge of political right and the one source from which civil authority flows, is—the multitude. Those who exercise power directly, do so only as the delegates of the people; these are the real rulers, and to them alone belongs the right to determine, to change, or to modify the structure of their civil institutions and the form of government under which they choose to live. Now, it is plain that this principle, from which Liberals seek to deduce the legitimacy of their political innovations, whatever may be thought of its soundness or truth, is not the principle from which Dante derived the legitimacy of his monarchy. Quite the contrary. Dante believes that the *subject* in which authority essentially resides is by a natural necessity different from the people, and he employs one whole book of the *De Monarchia* to prove the

¹ *Dante and other Essays*, by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's, pp. 128, 129, &c.

divine origin of civil power and to establish the claims of his Emperor on an independent basis of natural and eternal right. We are not called upon here to discuss the merits of these opposing systems. We have merely to note the fact of their opposition. According to the liberal principle, government is the reflection of the sovereign will of the people; the king reigns, but does not govern; the people are the judges in the last resort of right and wrong, of what is true or false, moral or immoral; they are the real rulers, and their verdict is supreme. According to Dante, human government should be the reflection of the heavenly order; his monarchy would have the greatest possible splendour; his emperor would have jurisdiction over the whole world: he would be an absolute prince, the image of God ruling all with undisputed power; the aristocracy of this world-wide ruler, supreme in temporals as the Pope is in spirituals, would be composed of the sovereigns of the various nations and principalities, who should remain real sovereigns, but, at the same time, dependent on him in matters civil, as vassals on their lord. He would compose their difficulties, heal their quarrels, check their covetousness, and keep them all on a footing of peace and justice; whilst they and their people should retain their traditional privileges and enjoy absolute autonomy in all that concerns their domestic affairs; subject, of course, to the condition of forming part of one vast empire. In this way, as M. Ozanam says, "*Le Pontife serait le vassal temporel de César et l'Empereur l'ouaille spirituelle de Saint Pierre.*"¹ The priesthood and the empire would be independent of one another in their respective spheres, but mutually subordinate in their transverse relations.

By what concurrence of circumstances the Popes came to occupy the position of mediators, and to hold, besides their temporal dominion, a sort of civil primacy in the world in these times, is known to all who are acquainted with the early history and formation of European nations. Now it was at this primacy that Dante took umbrage, and not at

¹ Ozanam, *Dante et la Philosophie Catholique au XIII^{ième} Siècle*, p. 380.

the temporal power understood in its restricted and formal sense. This was the very fundamental test-point between Guelphs and Ghibellines—whether the Pope or the Emperor was to be supreme in civil matters. Dante would allow the Pope no control whatever over the Emperor in matters of civil government. It was, indeed, to this authority, frequently exercised in favour of the people against their feudal lords; frequently wielded in defence of Italian freedom and independence against German encroachments; frequently employed to save the Church from the cupidity of kings and rulers, that Dante attributed the political and social ruin from which the world suffered in his day. In such a judgment he was unjust and indefensible. He was led to it by passion and by a sense of personal grievance. The bitterness of exile to so sensitive a nature was not easily overcome. But, even supposing all that is attributed to him of this nature were in reality written and held by him, it would still be wide of the mark, and would not affect the Pope's temporal sovereignty at all in the sense that is sought to be made out of it. The Papal supremacy in temporals to which Dante objects differs *toto cœlo* from the Papal principedom which modern Italians have set themselves to annihilate. Whenever he accuses ecclesiastical government of cupidity, or excess, or of being the cause of social strife and disorder, he has always in his mind, not the temporal sovereignty of the Pontiff in a small state, but his real or fancied temporal supremacy in the whole world. Keeping this distinction well before us we shall now adduce the most striking passages in Dante's works which bear out our contention, and reply to those which are so frequently quoted in an opposite sense.

1. In the second canto of the *Inferno* Dante calls attention to the admirable providence of God by which Rome and its empire were prepared in the eternal design to be the centre of the spiritual world and the temporal seat of Christ's Vicar on earth.

“La quale e il quale, a voler dir vero.
 Fur stabiliti per lo loco santo
 U' siede il succe or del maggior Piero.”

This was an idea which has been eloquently developed by St. Augustine¹ in the "City of God" and by St. Leo the Great, in a famous sermon.² Rome and its empire were pre-ordained for the foundation of the Church and the propagation of Christianity. The temporal here is inseparably bound with the spiritual.

"For he³ of our dear *Rome* and *its great might*
Was chosen sire in heaven empyreal.
But *this* and *that* to speak truth definite
Were fixed and 'stablished for the Holy See
In which great Peter's Vicar sits of right."⁴

It cost Dante the Ghibelline something to make this admission: hence "a voler dir vero;" "to tell the truth." Even such prejudiced writers as Orlandini⁵ are obliged to admit that the evident sense of this passage as it is found in the readings of the best editions, is, that "if we wish to speak in good faith we must confess that Rome and its empire, founded when Æneas visited Elysium, were providentially established for the Chair of Peter, who alone was to rule in the City of the Seven Hills, and to hold there both spiritual and temporal sway." At the time that Dante wrote these lines the Popes were sitting in the Chair of Peter wielding in Rome the double sceptre which they had received by right. If he considered the temporal principedom which they then held as an evil and a calamity, he was not the man to shrink from saying so, and he would surely not have set it down as having been fixed and established for the "Holy See," by a special dispensation of the loving providence of God.

2. Dante describes in one of his visions in purgatory the soul of Manfred, son of the Emperor Frederick II., who during his lifetime had made several efforts to conquer the kingdom of Puglia, which was then held by the Sovereign Pontiff, and transfer it to the Imperial Crown. For this the prince was excommunicated by several Popes, and the poet fully recognises the binding force of that Papal sentence; for he

¹ *De Civitate Dei*, vii.

² *Serm. ii. in Epiphani.*

³ Æneas.

⁴ Canto ii.

⁵ *Giornale del Centenario di Dante*, page 6.

makes Manfred himself confess to its effects in the future world.

“ Dreadful and dire the sins that wrapt me round,
But such wide arms hath goodness infinite
That room for each returning soul is found.

Nor by their malediction lost, I deem
Is love eternal beyond power of change
So long as hope's young buds with verdure gleam.
True is it he whom burdened sins estrange
From Holy Church, though he repent at last,
Must needs upon this bank an exile range.

3. In the last cantos of *Purgatorio* we notice amidst the illustrious personages who follow the chariot of the Pontiff, the fair figure of a lady, Countess Matilda, who has access like Beatrice to this region of Purgatory from her home in Paradise, and who during her lifetime not only defended the patrimony of St. Peter against Henry IV., but strengthened and augmented it by generous donations of her own. We are aware that Costa, Bianchi, and other modern commentators deny the fact that Matilda is meant here by

“ The lady all alone who as she went
Sang evermore, and gathered flower on flower,
With whose bright hues her path was all bespente.”

But all the old commentators—Buti, Jacopo della Lana, Benvenuto da Imola, Pietro di Dante—agree that it is she who is honoured here. Even amongst modern commentators, Blanc and Tommaseo will not be suspected of partiality towards the Papacy, yet they admit that Matilda and no other is here described.

4. Amid the ruins of the Roman Empire the kings and dukes of Lombardy, towards the end of the eighth century advanced certain pretensions over the rest of Italy, not at all unlike those which Victor Emmanuel, Cavour, and Garibaldi have asserted in our own day with a greater show of success. Had the former kept themselves within the bounds of reason and justice they would in all likelihood have then established an union of interests in Italy which would have protected it from many a subsequent invasion ; but, like their

modern imitators, they laid impious hands on the property of the Holy See, coveted the States of the Church, and made war on the Papacy. As a natural result their influence was blasted and their power completely overthrown. The strong hand of Charlemagne reduced them to impotence, and confirmed the Pope more securely than ever in his temporal dominion. And this action of the Emperor is made by Dante a special title of glory for him in Paradise :

“ And when the Lombard tooth began to bite
The Holy Church, beneath its sheltering wing
Came Charlemagne to help with conquering might.”

And in company with Orlando and Godfrey, and Robert Guiscard, and many other well-known patrons and upholders of the Papal power, the great Emperor takes his high place in heaven foremost among

“ The blessed spirits who, ere yet they rose
To heaven, were of such renowned fame
As on each Muse abundant store bestows.”¹

5. In the sixteenth paragraph of the first book of the *Monarchia*, Dante when developing his system explains :—

“ It is to be remembered that when we speak of the human race being governed by one single prince it is not intended that every minor jurisdiction should be exercised by that one ; what we mean is, that nations, kingdoms, and cities, having all their special characteristics, which require different laws to govern them, the whole race should be ruled and regulated by the monarchy only in these things which are common to all, and that particular princes should receive these common laws from the Emperor and see to their execution.”

Again in the *Convito Tratt.*, iv., chap. iv. :—

“ In order to put an end to these wars and their causes, the whole world should become a monarchy—that is to say, there should be one empire with one prince, who, possessing all and wanting nothing, should hold kings satisfied within the limits of their realms, that peace might reign amongst them, and citizens should enjoy tranquillity and peace.”

It did not, therefore, enter into Dante's project that particular kings and princes should be reduced to the

¹ Pars. Can. iv.

condition of ordinary subjects or deprived of their traditional jurisdiction; a curb was merely to be applied to their greed, and the strong hand of restraint to be wielded over their passions. But inasmuch as the Popes, who with very few exceptions were men of the purest lives and of the most lofty and disinterested aims, were much less liable to become the victims of cupidity than other princes, we should not take it that Dante wished to make special exception of them, *stripping* them of all temporal authority whilst leaving it to others, unless we had overwhelming proofs to the contrary. The proofs, however, are as we have seen, all in the other direction.

6. On the death of Pope Clement V., in 1314, the Conclave had assembled at Carpentras, in the south of France, for the election of his successor. Dante wrote to the four Italian Cardinals who have gone thither for the election, urging upon them the sad condition of Rome without its Pontiff and ruler: "How doth the city sit solitary that was full of people? How does she become as a widow that was mistress of the nations?" In the most suppliant language he begs of Cardinal Orsini to bring back the Pope to Rome, and, if possible, to bring about the election of an Italian Cardinal. If Dante had been the enemy that he is represented of Papal power in temporals, and had held the earthly principedom of the Pope to be the greatest obstacle to Italian unity and freedom, is it likely that he would have thus ardently desired the Pope's return to the Eternal City, and entreated his Holiness to restore order, peace, and harmony to his suffering country? Is it not more probable that he would have endeavoured to keep the Pontiff at a distance until Italy should have been constituted in all her provinces, and in every element of her political life totally independent of his control?

The general intent of the poet's mind, the reverence with which he invariably speaks of "Holy Church;" his profound and unalterable faith in her supernatural mission, his oft-repeated distinction between the sanctity of the office and the frailty of its holder; his frequent allusions to the temporal aids that Providence destined for her support,

the whole drift of his purpose and current of his thoughts sustain the theory, which the passages above quoted make clear enough. It is almost unnecessary to add that the poet himself supplies us with many other proofs of his recognition not only of the fact, but also of the right and necessity of Papal sovereignty in Rome and its neighbourhood. But we are satisfied that those we have given are quite sufficient.

We shall now examine the passages on which the revolutionists rely when they claim the patronage of Dante. The first and most important of these is to be found in the nineteenth canto of the *Inferno*, when the poet in one of the pits of "Male Bolge," witnessing the writhing torture of the Simoniacs, exclaims:—

" Ah, Constantine, to how much ill gave birth,
Not thy conversion, but that plenteous dower
Which the first wealthy father gained from thee."

Again, in *Paradiso*, canto xx., when the poet noticed Constantine amongst the *righteous kings*, he says, referring once more to the Emperor's supposed donation to Pope Sylvester I.:

" Now knows he how the harm, whereof the cause
Was found in his good deed, works him no ill,
Though on the world much hurt and harm it draws."

Nor should we seek to keep in the background the startling words of the second book of the *Monarchia*. "Oh, happy people! oh, glorious Italy! if the author of thy infirmity (*infirmator imperii tui*) had but never existed, or if his intention had never been belied."¹

These difficulties are not at all insurmountable, for it has to be remembered that not long before the period in which Dante lived the Popes were much more powerful and respected than they were in his day, and the poet himself

¹ "O felicem populum, O Ausoniam te gloriosam, si vel nunquam infirmator ille imperii tui natus fuisset vel nunquam sua pia intentio ipsum fefellisset."

draws a vivid picture of the happiness that reigned when that Papal influence was at its full:—

“Florence then within her ancient towers, from which even to this day she hears the call to terce and none, lived still in peace, sober and chaste. She had yet no necklace, no crown, no women decked, no girdle fairer to behold than the figure that bore it. Sardinapalus had not yet arrived to show what indoor vice might reign. Montemalo was not yet surpassed by your Uccellatoio.”

It was the later excesses of the Guelphs for which Dante held the Popes responsible, but which the Popes were not always able effectually to restrain. Hence in temporal matters he would have them subject to the Emperor, like other kings. Whilst he undoubtedly gives expression to the belief that Constantine, *though acting well* (*dal suo bene operar*) and with good intent (*sotto buono intenzion*), by making the Pope a temporal prince, and removing the seat of his own empire to Bysantium, is in some sort the remote cause of the many evils which, he imagines, are the result of the development of this first donation, this is surely very far from saying that the Pope should now be dethroned, and his possessions confiscated, and that the work of European civilization carried out under the ægis of his protection and authority should be undone. The empire had gone to pieces, and the Papacy had fallen into its place, and (as Dante the Ghibelline and the Idealist maintained) had usurped its authority to the great detriment of mankind. His remedy for this unfortunate state of things was the restoration of the empire; but that restoration did not by any means imply the spoliation of minor sovereigns, and least of all the confiscation of the patrimony of the Church, consecrated and sanctified by its sacred use, and by the traditional prescription of more than six hundred years.¹

But then we are confronted with a passage in the *De Monarchia*,² which, we are told will prove that according to Dante, the Pope not only could not hold temporal sovereignty, but that by reason of his ecclesiastical office

¹ See *Il Dominio Temporale dei Papi nel Concetto Politico di Dante Alighieri*, by Fr. P. F. Berardinelli, S.J., pp. 128, 129, and fol.

² *De Monarchia*, lib. iii., sec. 9.

and spiritual occupation as head of the Church he is *ex rei natura* incapable of accepting it, and that furthermore the Emperor who is the head of the civil world, is for that same reason going beyond his powers if he seeks to confer it upon him. Such a donation would be simply null and void, from the radical incapacity on the one side to give, and on the other to receive, no man being empowered to sacrifice what is necessary to his divinely-appointed mission or to accept what does not belong to it. We agree that there are many passages which bear this general complexion, both in the *De Monarchia* and the *Divine Comedy*; but it must ever be borne in mind that Dante was arguing against the Guelphs, and that the sort of dominion he would refuse the Popes on the above-mentioned grounds, is the supreme temporal dominion, the civil primacy and supremacy which the Guelphs, for political reasons of their own, arrogated to the Pontiffs, but which the Pontiffs themselves never for a moment claimed. It is this supremacy, or even anything that would lead to it, that the Emperor, according to Dante, is incompetent to confer, and that the Pontiff has no right or power to accept. And to put the matter beyond all doubt the poet declares in the third book of the *Monarchia*: "Nevertheless the Emperor could in support of the Church confer patrimony and other things, keeping always intact his own dominion, the unity of which will not suffer diminution; and the Vicar of Christ can receive them, not for himself, but as the steward of their fruits, for the Church and for the poor of Christ." (*Pro Ecclesia proque Christi pauperibus*): and he adds still further, that "to say the Church abuses the patrimony so conferred, is most unseemly."

But when all else fails them the anti-papal critics fall back upon the vision in *Purgatorio* of the chariot and the gryphon, the dragon and the eagle, the harlot and the giant. This is, beyond a doubt, the worst passage in all Dante—the most injurious to the Papacy, the most offensive in its elaboration to Catholic feeling, and the most hurtful to belief. It was prompted by anger and by the envenomed chagrin of the poet at the transfer of the Papal Court from Rome to Avignon.

Hence the strain:—*Modicum et non videbitis me et iterum modicum et videbitis me.* And yet, that very chariot drawn by Christ Himself as symbolized by the gryphon, surrounded by the figures of the Old and New Testament, is admitted by all critics to represent here the Roman Pontificate; and with it the Church of Christ is so far identified, that what is injurious to the Papacy is injurious to the Church. It is a blow delivered in passion—an accusation, a reproach; but it comes from one who is at heart a friend, who means well, and who, severe though he may be in denouncing corruption, and in lecturing into a sense of duty those who, in his opinion, had wandered from their high estate, yet does so from within, with no thought, hidden or avowed, of rising in revolt against the majestic office in which he had ever recognised the divine mission and the keys of authority. Others, indeed, may turn these charges to account, with a specious display of triumph, but certainly not those who argue from Dante against the temporal power. The reverse is, if anything, more patent in this vision; for it had direct reference to the time when the Popes, displeased and almost disheartened at the stiff-necked conduct of their Roman subjects, abandoned the Holy City; left the Romans to manage their temporal affairs as best they could, and took their residence in another land where they might discharge with greater freedom their duties to the Christian world. That was what roused the anger of Dante to its highest pitch, and what made him irreverently borrow the allegories of the Apocalypse in order to stigmatize their action. It has also to be observed that the feathers of the eagle, which fall into the chariot, represent not the temporal goods of the Church in general, but the imperial power supposed to have been, virtually at all events, conferred by Constantine. And even these do not effect of themselves the transformation or corruption, until the dragon from beneath undermines the spirit of poverty and humility and so removes an important part of the machinery which binds the vehicle together, and thus effectually impedes its course.¹

¹ See *Dante Allighieri Cattolico Apostolico, Romano*, by Fr. Mauro Ricci.

It, therefore, appears certain and clear to us, that if Dante regarded the right of the empire to civil pre-eminence as inalienable and indivisible, he likewise looked upon the temporal patrimony conferred upon the Church as inviolable and sacred. There is, indeed, an impressive contrast between the great Allighieri giving his last years to the solemn meditation of the Credo, of the Sacraments, of the Decalogue, of the Penitential Psalms, turning with humility and confidence to the bosom of the Eternal Father:—

“ A voi devotamente ora sospira
L' anima mia, per aquistar virtute
Al passo forte che a se la tira ;”

dying under the roof of Guido Novello, in all the fulness and simplicity of faith ; laid to rest, according to his desire, in the robes of his beloved St. Francis—a solemn contrast, it must be said, between him and the host of anti-clericals and liberals who now desire to number him amongst their own. Those who can picture to themselves the monarchy of peace and order shadowed forth in his noble but impossible ideal can answer whether modern Italy corresponds to what he dreamt of. When we recall the scathing words in which he denounced Philippe le Bel, and the hireling persecutors of Boniface VIII.—that same Boniface to whom he attributed all his political misfortunes, we can fancy what language he would find to describe the violence and the sacrileges of modern times, the relentless policy which once more holds

“ Christ in His Vicar captive to the foe.”

When the great sacrilege of our era was about to be consummated, Cardinal Newman¹ recalled the example of the Hebrews, who in the days of the prophet Samuel, threw off the yoke of God and clamoured for a king. “And we also will be like other nations, and our king shall judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles for us.” And when Samuel warned them, and told them that this king would rule them with an iron hand:—“He will take your sons, and he will put them in his chariots ; and he will make them his horsemen and his running footmen to go before

¹ *The Pope and the Revolution.*

his chariots. He will take the tenth of your corn and the revenues of your vineyards. Your flocks also will he take, and you shall be his servants." They would not hear him, but should have their king like other peoples. The Italians have got their king, and they have been put into the yoke, and their vineyards and their corn have been taken from them with a vengeance. When they come to realize once more the fertility of their dreams of earthly aggrandisement, and return to the old and true-honoured allegiance of a glorious past, it is probable that little more shall be heard, for a time, at least, of Dante's opposition to the temporal power.

J. F. HOGAN.

WHEN ENGLAND WAS "MERRIE" ENGLAND.

"They called thee "Merry England" in old time;
A happy people won for thee that name,
With envy heard in many a distant clime."

WORDSWORTH.

SOME three or four hundred years ago the whole of England, from Berwick-on-Tweed in the north to Land's End in the south, was bound together in the unity of the Catholic faith. Then master and man, the lord and labourer, worshipped at the same altar and knelt before the same shrine, and though innumerable were the churches, monasteries, and convents scattered over the land, yet one and all were dedicated to the service of the same religion. At morn, noon, and eventide, the joyous bells¹ would ring out their merry peals from a thousand turrets and spires, and the reaper would stop his busy sickle, and the housewife her humming spinning-wheel, and cross themselves devoutly as they knelt down and recited with becoming reverence the *Angelus Domini*, in honour of the Word made Flesh.

¹The bell-foundries of Salisbury, Norwich, Gloucester, London, and other of our cities, turned out bells of truer and sweeter tone than bell-founders with all the aids of modern appliances produce in these days. To their skill this country owes the honour of being known as "*the ringing isle*." See Denton's *England in the Fifteenth Century*.

Those were the "good old times" when England was "Merrie England," and "merrie" because there was more of the bright sunshine of God's grace and truth about it than it has ever enjoyed since. Indeed we love to linger upon the thought of those thrice-blessed days, and to picture to ourselves the peaceful condition of our country before it was rent and spoiled by religious strife, and torn by conflicting factions. Nor could we easily forget that period, even if we would: there is too much to keep the memory of it fresh and green. Hundreds of chapels, churches, cathedrals, and monasteries—some in ruins, some yet standing—are still to be seen in our midst, bearing a silent but eloquent testimony to the historical fact that Great Britain was once Catholic to the very core.¹

Indeed, it is an indisputable fact, that among the many vast ecclesiastical structures now studding this land, the most superb and majestic² are just precisely those that have come down to us from Catholic times. All admit that the finest of England's cathedrals and churches are those which were designed by Catholic architects, raised by Catholic hands, and paid for with Catholic gold. The adorable Sacrifice of the Altar was once offered up in them; to their hallowed precincts the sinner wended his way when sinking under the burden of his iniquities; and old and young, rich and poor, knelt side by side to feast upon the Sacred Body of Christ within their walls.

Had you, gentle reader, been passing the spacious entrance to Westminster Abbey four hundred years ago, your ears would have caught the solemn chant of the black-robed monks, and the measured notes of the choristers, as they re-echoed through the sacred fane.

¹ In the year 1497 the Secretary to the Venetian Embassy gave the following report (printed by the Camden Society) of the religious state of England:—"They all hear mass every day, and say many paternosters [rosaries] in public . . . and who ever is at all able to read carries with him the Office of Our Lady, and they recite it in church with some companion in a low voice, verse by verse, after the manner of religious."

² It was during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that Gothic architecture may be said to have attained the highest pitch of graceful proportion and luxuriant beauty. See Denton's *England in the Fifteenth Century*. Introduction, page 52.

Let us push back the massive oaken door, and take our stand within the ancient pile. There, in the dim religious light we see the priest at the altar, vested in alb and stole and chasuble, with the deacon and sub-deacon on either side; candles are burning near the tabernacle, flowers are scattering their sweet fragrance around; the censer is swinging, and clouds of incense are rising, like a symbolized prayer, to heaven, just as we may see it in any Catholic church at the present day. Then, as the mass proceeds, the sanctuary bells ring out their silvery warning; the voices in the choir are hushed; the music sinks to a whisper; and every knee is reverently bent and every head is bowed as Jesus Christ, true God and true Man, descends upon the altar at the words of consecration pronounced by the celebrant. All this might have been witnessed within Westminster Abbey itself a few hundred years ago.

Now, alas! what a change has come o'er the scene. What do we see? Why, "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place." To-day Westminster Abbey lies desecrated. It has been converted into a heretical temple, and now serves the purpose of a kind of mortuary or immense sarcophagus;¹ a receptacle, in a word, for dead men's bones—for the bones of the poet, the patriot, and the politician; while Jesus Christ, in His sacramental presence, has been turned adrift to seek an asylum in the little iron chapel on the hill side, or in the poverty-stricken oratory in some crowded mews or dingy alley of our vast metropolis.

What we have said of the origin of Westminster Abbey may be said with equal truth of the splendid cathedrals of Bath and Wells, of Canterbury and Durham, of Gloucester and Hereford, of York and Ely, and Worcester, Lincoln, Salisbury, Winchester, and Norwich, as also of Fountains Abbey, Furness Abbey, Tintern Abbey, and of many more of lesser fame. These remain as memorials of the past. They stand stolidly while the ages sweep by, and

¹ Even men of no certain faith find a resting-place within its walls. One of the most recent examples is that of Charles Darwin, who, in his declining years, described himself, not as a Christian, but now as a Deist and now as an Agnostic. Vide *Darwin's Life and Correspondence*.

dynasties change, and generations slowly come and go; yea, stand like silent sentinels, bearing an indisputable and an eloquent testimony to the grand old faith of our Catholic forefathers which once knit the English people together so that like the early Christians they were all of one heart and one mind. And while, on the one hand, they tell of a happier age, so on the other hand they indicate in no uncertain manner the modern origin of the present English Church, and show to all who have eyes to see that Protestantism is but a thing of yesterday—the fungus growth of disobedience and rebellion. Indeed, when other witnesses were being banished the kingdom; when the axe and the hangman's rope were silencing many a loyal and fearless tongue, they still continued to speak and bear witness. Even in days of greatest tyranny, when blood flowed like water, and when none dared speak above their breath, these great and noble cathedrals still gave evidence, and kept the truth before the public mind, as if in fulfilment of the promise and prophecy of Christ, who declared that "when all others hold their peace, the very stones should cry out" in testimony of Him.

For over a thousand years this unity of faith had lasted. Then came evil times. The moral atmosphere grew dark and menacing. A wild storm of error swept with pitiless violence over the whole country, and laid waste one of the fairest portions of the vineyard of the Church. Unprincipled men rose into power, who knew not how to wield power. They trampled on the rights and liberties of the Church, and were guided in all their acts, not by the love of truth and of justice, but by greed and lust, and vanity and ambition. Unity of creed soon disappeared, because unity became impossible, so soon as the great principle and foundation of unity was destroyed. The supreme authority of the Church was denied. The keys that Christ had committed to Peter to loose or to fasten, to open or to close, were (so far, at least, as England was concerned) wrenched from his grasp, and placed in the hands of an adulterous king; and the rock upon which Christ had built His Church was no longer suffered to support the English portion of it, so that it fell a hopeless ruin. The Bible was substituted

for the Pope, and no other infallible authority in spiritual matters was recognised. Men were released from their allegiance to a divinely-appointed and living authority, because such an authority was no longer supposed to exist; and each man, woman, and child, was set at liberty to accept as true any interpretation he saw—or, what is quite the same thing, any interpretation he *fancied* he saw—in the Sacred Scriptures. What was the result? Well, the result in the religious world was much what the result in the scientific or commercial world would have been had men been suddenly released from all allegiance to the multiplication table. In fact, the utter confusion and misunderstanding that would have resulted in the money market and on the stock-exchange, were the multiplication table arranged to suit each one's fancy and inclination, but feebly represents the deplorable confusion, disagreement and strife, that arose in the religious world, so soon as the truths of faith were left to be drawn from the Bible at each one's discretion. This is no empty opinion; it is a fact which history itself puts beyond dispute.

Every fresh heresy which arose sprang from this system of private interpretation. The selfsame texts were made to support, not only different, but often even wholly contradictory doctrines. While "*This is My Body*" meant for one that it really was the adorable Body of Christ, for his neighbour it meant that it was *not* Christ's Body, but merely a symbol or figure of it. The most shocking and nefarious acts were justified in the same easy way, and every corrupt practice found a ready sanction in the pages of Holy Writ. Thus, when Charles the First was beheaded in 1649, proofs were actually adduced from Scripture to show that monarchy was an unlawful form of government, and that the Stuart King, was "the beast of the Apocalypse."¹ So again, when it was resolved to extirpate the Irish with fire and sword, the Scriptural example of the Amalekites was, of course, convenient and ready to hand. There is nothing so foul, so immoral, or so diabolical, but

¹ Consult *Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat*, Von Dr. Joseph Hergenröther.

private judgment will discover some verse of Scripture to recommend it. The greatest poet and most subtle judge of character of those days, does but give expression to this well-known truth when he asks in bewilderment and consternation "what damned error, but some sober brow will bless it, and approve it with a text?" Why, even the devil himself can quote Scripture for his own evil purposes, as, in fact, he actually did when he sought to tempt the Son of God to cast Himself headlong from the pinnacle of the Temple; for, in urging Him to this act of presumption, he did not hesitate to cite the authority of the Inspired Book in justification:—"Cast Thyself down, *for it is written* that He hath given His angels charge over Thee, and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest perchance Thou dash Thy foot against a stone." (Matt. iv. 6.)

The Holy Scriptures, when privately interpreted, have proved, not a bond of union, but just the opposite—a source of endless dissension and division. Of this, common sense might have informed us; but to common sense we may add the still more cogent testimony of history and experience. The new system was no sooner introduced than, all at once, forms of religious beliefs began to multiply and increase at an alarming rate. Unity—a vital condition of all truth, which is necessarily one and in harmony with itself—disappeared; and, one after another, myriad sects sprung into existence, as fungi about a fallen and rotten branch, the multiplicity and variety of which is as much the marvel as the scandal of modern times.

Not to speak of other countries; here, in this little island alone, we may point to some three or four hundred. A long list of several columns may be found in Whitaker's *Almanack*, commencing with the so-called "Advent Christians," and winding up with "Wesleyans," and "White Ribboned Christians" and other sects with appellations equally grotesque and fantastic. Each of these religious bodies teaches a different creed, follows a distinct practice, and leads a separate life.

What is the consequence? The consequence is, that not only the callous and indifferent man of the world, but

even the earnest and well-meaning inquirer, looking out over the country and seeing this strange sight, and watching all these religious sects and coteries, fighting, quarrelling, and squabbling among themselves; each rending the other; each jealous of the other; one asserting what the other denies; one blessing what the other anathematizes; and finding after many a sincere and earnest effort that it is quite impossible to reconcile them, or to reduce order out of chaos, comes at last to the melancholy, but surely not unnatural conclusion, that one religion is quite as good as another. "Well," we may hear him exclaim, "I suppose, after all, it matters very little *what* a man believes, or for the matter of that, whether he believes *anything* whatsoever!" Thus does one evil beget another, and abyss call upon abyss: "abyssus abyssum invocat."

What is so common in these days as absolute indifference to all dogmatic truth? "Well, really," remarks the easy-going and benevolent man of the world, "it signifies little what may be a man's religious views" (observe, he speaks of the infallible utterances of divine wisdom and the definitions of revealed truths, as "views" and "opinions"). "Ah!" he continues, "it is not a man's creed, it is his conduct alone that is of any real importance! If a man be honest, sober, truthful; if he be a loyal subject, a faithful husband, and a good father, *I* shan't inquire whether he believes in indulgences, or purgatory, or the invocation of saints. No! if he serves his country, pay his debts, and is kind and neighbourly, the rest makes very little difference. Whether he believe in the Pope of Rome or in the Caliph of Bagdad; whether he pins his faith on the Archbishop of Canterbury or prefers the more martial guidance of General Booth, can surely be of no practical importance whatsoever. Why, for all the good it will do him, he may follow whomsoever he pleases, from Sikes, the town-crier, to the Grand Lama of Mongolia, or even the great Panjandrum himself! It is a man's character, disposition, conduct, and mode of life, that make him worthy or unworthy, good or bad; not his creed or religious belief. Pah! Do you imagine I would condemn a man, or think the less of him on account of his faith, or his want of faith? No! not for Hecuba."

Such is the style of reasoning that finds favour, and is in fashion now-a-days. And, strange to say, such fine-spun and extravagant nonsense passes for the highest wisdom, and is welcomed with smiles and comments of the warmest approbation. It *looks* so kind. There is something so pre-eminently tolerant and forbearing about it. "Well, really," soft lips are heard to whisper, "what a singularly amiable old gentleman! What a charming man! Isn't he a dear! How broad-minded! How unsectarian! Such sturdy common sense, don't you know. Is it not really encouraging? What a capacious soul that man must have! Why, every aching head can find a soft pillow on his ample breast. He has not a hard or an unkind word to fling at anyone," &c.

It is the very speciousness of this method of reasoning that constitutes its chief danger, and, let me add, its chief attraction. It is precisely because it wears the garb of charity and peace, and broad philanthropy, that men are so readily satisfied with it, and give it countenance. They forget that, though peace is of great value, that yet even peace may be too dearly purchased. That, however much we may desire it, we must not sacrifice truth and justice to obtain it, since truth is of incomparably more importance than peace. Further, they lose sight of the fact that Christ tells us He came to bring "*not* peace but the *sword*;" "to set a man against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." (Matt. x. 34-36.) And again He warns us that "a man's enemies shall be they of his own household;" and so forth. The great objection to the very prevalent opinion that a man's creed is of no importance, is that such a view is untrue in itself, most mischievous in its results, categorically condemned by God, anathematized by the Church, and ruinous to souls. Let us try and unmask this erroneous statement, and look upon it in its true colours.

We must begin at the beginning. God is infinite in wisdom: that is to say, He is infinitely wiser than we are. To assert that either we, or any creature whatsoever know all that God knows, is to assert that our knowledge is boundless and inexhaustible, which, besides being unweavably

blasphemous, is also intolerably absurd. Consequently, there must be an innumerable number of truths known to God yet unknown to man. Truths, indeed, as little suspected by man as the theory of conic sections is suspected by the fly on the ceiling, and just as little within his grasp. If God so please what is to prevent His making known some of these hidden truths to us? Now, the vital question arises: if He *does* reveal them, are we, or are we not, bound to assent to them? Let us put the case fairly before us, and discuss it with candour. When the uncreated wisdom of God condescends to inform us of some sublime truth—relating, let us say, to His divine nature, such as the mystery of the Adorable Trinity; or to His dealings with men, such as the institution of the Church, or of the seven sacraments—does it impose no obligation upon us? Are we still free to accept or reject, as we choose, or to suspend our judgment? or even to say, as many do practically, "I am too busy now to go into these matters; I must defer all considerations to some other time"? Can we, considering who we are, and considering who God is, refuse for a single instant to believe, without being guilty of the grossest contempt and the most unpardonable insult? Surely, to hesitate and falter, and still more to deliberately reject any dogma, is to call in question the veracity of God, and to deny one of the greatest of all His attributes, and consequently to offer Him a marked and flagrant indignity. To refuse belief in what God reveals, is as great a crime as to refuse obedience to what He commands, and can in no sense be a matter of indifference. The thoughtless may pronounce it a question of little moment, but it is abundantly evident to all who seriously reflect, that if God takes the trouble to make known to us the secrets of His mind, we, on our part, are bound by the strictest duty to take the trouble to believe them, and to accept them with our whole hearts.

Or we may approach the question from another point of view. Thus: we are created not for time, but for eternity. Our destiny is to be for ever supremely happy with God in heaven. In a word, the final purpose of our existence, so far from being a natural one, is essentially spiritual and supernatural. Now, such being the end before us, what

shall we say of the means necessary to conduct us to that end? According to the well-recognised and time-worn axiom, "the means must be proportioned to the end." And what are we to understand by that? Obviously, that there must be, at least, some sort of equality and similarity between the means by which an end is to be obtained and the end itself. Good! Then, the end being in the case under consideration wholly supernatural, the means must be equally so; *i. e.*, must be supernatural. But, what is supernatural stands not within the range of unaided reason. The mind of man, however keen and piercing, even were it the mind of a Plato or an Aristotle, possesses no faculties of itself whereby it can discover, much less lay hold of or apply, the supernatural means by which, and by which alone, the supernatural life in all its fulness is to be secured. Without a definite knowledge of the revealed truths of God; in other words, without a real faith in God's word, we can no more wend our way along the narrow road which leads to heaven, than, without wings, a bird can soar into the sun-lit clouds.

Hence it is quite clear that we are under the strictest obligation of listening with all docility to the teaching of God, who alone can impart to us the information that is indispensably necessary. To tell a man that it matters not what he believes, is to tell one, whose treasure is securely locked up in one of Chubb's fire-and-burglar-proof safes, that it is not of the slightest consequence what kind of key he applies to the lock, but that, provided his intentions are good, and he sincerely desires to get at his treasure, one key is as good as another. No! If we wish to reach our Father's mansion, we must learn the way there—a way which our Lord warns us is narrow and strait; and if we would learn the way, we must listen to and follow the only Guide that can point it out, *viz.*, Christ and His Church; for the one authority is identical with the other: "who heareth you, heareth Me."

Further, God is supreme Lord and Master of all things visible and invisible. He alone can give us eternal life, just as He alone has given us our temporal life. But, observe, He gives it not to all indiscriminately, but to those alone

who fulfil certain conditions: in such wise that we shall have it or forfeit it, according to whether we satisfy such conditions or no. Is it not then a matter of the first importance to know without any doubt what those conditions are? Or, in other words, is not a revelation a necessity for us?

Thus reason and common sense unite to prove the fallacy and impious absurdity of modern sceptics, who openly teach that faith is a matter of indifference, and that one form of belief is as good as another.

But let us appeal, in conclusion, to that highest authority of all, viz., to God Himself addressing us through the Holy Scriptures. The Holy Ghost, speaking through St. Paul, lays it down most explicitly that: "without faith it is *impossible* to please God." Not simply "difficult," or "almost" impossible, but absolutely impossible! Yet the shallow feather-headed man about town will try and persuade me that it does not signify one iota. But, in the name of common prudence, whom am I to believe? St. Paul, inspired by God, or my friend Brown or Jones, inspired by prejudice and pride?

Again, our Lord speaking in His own person, uses still more forcible words. Words, indeed, enough to make the dullest ears tingle. On sending His Apostles to publish His doctrine to the world, He dismissed them with these words of awful portent:—"Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he *that believeth not shall be condemned.*" God, in whose hands is every soul, here distinctly warns us that wilfully to refuse belief in the special truths taught by the Apostles and their successors, is to incur the dread sentence of eternal condemnation; or, in plain English, to suffer damnation. Unless, therefore, damnation be a matter of indifference; unless it be all the same whether we pass an eternity in the excruciating agonies of hell, or amid the ecstatic delights of heaven, we fail to see how it can be at all a matter of indifference whether we believe falsehood or truth.

Again, Christ warns us that whosoever will not hear the

Church (*i. e.*, His living mouth-piece) is to be accounted as the heathen and the publican. (Matt. xviii. 17.) If, therefore, men tell us that we may follow our own devices, and be guided by our own counsel and private judgment, and close up our ears to the Church's teaching, what becomes of Christ's threats? The Eternal Son of God bids me regard such a creature as "a heathen and a publican," yet the Brown, Jones, and Robinsons of Protestantism would have me embrace him as "a man and a brother"!

The Apostle St. John puts the matter still more forcibly and emphatically. He says:—"Who believeth not, is already judged." (iii. 18.) "Judged," here means condemned, *i. e.*, judged unworthy of all claim to eternal life; sentence of eternal reprobation is already passed upon him—"nondum apparuit judicium, et jam factum est judicium," as St. Augustine observes. It may, of course, be revoked by repentance and a return to faith; but while his obduracy endures, the execution of the sentence awaits but the severance of the vital cord which attaches him to life.

Many further considerations might be added; but, perhaps, more than enough has already been said to impress on our indulgent readers the danger and the absolute fallacy contained in the common and stereotyped view, so often expressed and so loudly applauded, that it is not a matter of any serious importance what a man may choose to believe. We must beware of being taken in by such sophisms, now so current in the world.

God, the Infinite Truth cannot be indifferent to error, which is as opposed to Him as darkness to light. He cannot, therefore, be equally pleased whether we believe what is true or what is false. Truth must, by its own intrinsic nature be one, indivisible, and the same in all places and at all times. Therefore it follows, as night the day, that, though there may be many creeds, there can be but one *true* creed; though many Churches, but one *true* Church—*i. e.*, but one Church established and founded by Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life,

JOHN S. VAUGHAN,

ULICK DE BURGO, FIRST EARL OF CLAN- RICARDE.

IN the year 1543, Ulick De Burgo, popularly known as the MacWilliam Oughter, received an invitation from Henry VIII. to present himself at the Royal Manor, at Greenwich, on the 1st of July, following. As the purpose of the invitation was to make him the recipient of certain special marks of Royal favour, it is needless to add that it was gladly accepted. Hitherto there were but few in Ireland, who either sought or accepted Henry's favours. His rule was unpopular from the beginning. It was remembered in Ireland that it was inaugurated in blood. The recollection of the cruel treatment of the Geraldines was still fresh in the memories of Irishmen; and yet the MacWilliam Oughter, saw in the favour of his Royal patron but the fulfilment of his highest aims and most cherished ambition. No doubt his claims on his Majesty had grown stronger recently. From being a man of "wylde governance in those partes where he dwelled, obeying neither the king nor his Grace's laws," he had been brought into good order and conversation with the "king's honourable counsell." He had accepted Henry's supremacy, not alone in temporal matters, but in spiritual matters also. And as he had adopted his Royal Master's religious opinions, so too he copied his profligacy, and trampled equally on the sanctity of marriage and the dictates of honour.

De Burgo's appearance at Greenwich was an occasion of much interest to the fair ladies and the titled gentlemen who formed Henry's splendid Court. They perhaps missed at Greenwich Manor the excitement and brilliant pageants of Hampton Court. But it was at least calculated to break the monotony of the place, to have an opportunity of seeing this degenerate Norman, who had long exercised the almost irresponsible authority of an Irish Chieftain. And was he not the representative of a family that was allied by the ties of kindred with the reigning sovereign—a family that had long since degenerated and forgotten its loyalty—a family

that, repudiating English habits of dress and language, had adopted those of the Irish, and became "more Irish than the Irish themselves"? Such, indeed, the De Burgos affected to be, when it was consistent with their own interests. But Ulick Burke did not come alone to Henry's Court. He was accompanied by Murrough O'Brien, of Thomond, the degenerate representative of Ireland's greatest monarch, Brian of the Tributes.

It was considered desirable to impress those chieftains with a sense of the magnificence of the English Court, as well as of the generosity of the king. The occasion was therefore availed of for a Court pageant. The Queen's closet was richly "hanged with cloth of arras, and well carpetted with the freshest rushes." And after the "King's Majesty was come into his closet to heare High Masse, those Earles in company, went into the Queen's closet aforesaid, and there after sacring of High Masse put on their robes of Estate;" for it will be remembered that the king, though he rejected the Pope, retained the Mass.

At length, when fully arrayed in their state robes, they were conducted to the Presence Chamber, where the king with his Council—the Ambassadors of Scotland—and "other noble persons of his realme, as well temporal as spiritual, to a great number," had assembled to receive them. The Earls Elect were introduced to the king, who sat in state, by the Earls of Derby and Ormond; but in this connection it should be remembered that Margaret, daughter of Ormond, was De Burgo's mother.¹ The letters patent were then handed to "the Lord Chamberlayne, and the Lord Chamberlayne delivered them to the great Chamberlayne, and the Lord great Chamberlayne to the King's Majesty," who had them openly read by his Secretary, "And when he came to 'Cincturam gladii,' the Viscount Lisle presented to the king the sword; and the king girded the sword about the said Earl bawdrickwise, the foresaid Earl kneeling, and the Lords standing that lead him." His Majesty then presented each with a chain of gold, to which was attached a

¹ *State Papers.*

valuable cross. After raising five of their attendants to the rank of baronets, they were conducted to the Council Chamber, where a rich banquet was prepared, preceded by "trumpetters and officers of arms," Lord Clanricarde was led to his place, by the Earl of Ormond and Lord Cobham—where after the "second course, he was officially saluted under his new title as—" ¹ "Tres hault et puissant Seigneur—Guillaume Bourghe, conte de Clanricckard Seigneur de Downkellyn du Royaulme de Irelande." The king also bestowed upon him his robes of state, and "payd all manner of duties belonging to the same." But this was not all. He was anxious that the new peer should maintain a state becoming his newly-acquired dignity. He conferred upon him, therefore, a mansion and lands near Dublin, for keeping his "retainers and horses," whenever State duties made his presence in the metropolis desirable or necessary. It was to him, not to the Earl of Thomond, that Henry gave what was then, at least, regarded as the harp of Brian Boroimbhe. This interesting relic is still preserved in Trinity College, and still popularly known as King Brian's harp.

But those events marked the close of a singular career. Ulick de Burgo returned to Ireland "not perfectly recovered from a fever which he had taken in England." Within the following year we find the record of his death. There were but few to congratulate him at home on his new honours, and fewer still, perhaps, to pay even a faint tribute to his memory after he had passed away. De Burgo was never a popular chief. If he was loved by few, and feared by many, he was, perhaps, hated by most. And in any case the conditions on which the royal favours were conferred upon him were certain to be received with marked disfavour in the extensive districts over which his lordship claimed authority. Amongst those conditions the following stood out prominently:—

"That the laws of England may be executed in Clanricarde, and the naughty laws and customs of that country be put away for ever."

¹ *Ibid.*

“Item that there may be sent into Ireland some well-learned Irishmen brought up in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, not infected with the poyson of the Bishop of Rome, and they be first approved by the King’s Majesty, and then to be sent to preach the Word of God in Ireland.”

Such conditions proclaimed apostacy from religion and country alike. And the marked and general popular disfavour in which he was held, could be only intensified by the Church plunder which he also accepted. The confiscated lands of the Abbey of Via Nova, Clonfert, better known in the district as Abbey Gormacon, were conferred on him. Hardiman informs us that the grant was only of a third of its first-fruits. But we think it more probable that the grant included the entire property of that ancient abbey. This opinion seems to be confirmed by an entry in the patent Rolls of Henry VIII., dated 1st July, 1543, recording a grant to—

“Willic Boruc, otherwise MacWilliam, of the style and dignity of Earl of Clanricarde and Baron of Dunkellen, and furthermore a grant to him of all that the Monastery of Via Nova, Clonfertenses Diocesis, with all the lands, houses, &c., appurtenant thereto.”

This remarkable man, who was the recipient of so many favours at the hands of his sovereign, was the representative of the MacWilliams, who in defiance of the English crown held much of the extensive territory of Clanricarde for some generations. He was grandson of Ulick of Knockto, and son of Richard, surnamed the “Great,” by the Lady Margaret, daughter of the Earl of Ormond. It may be unprofitable to inquire what were the special claims which Richard de Burgo had to be styled “great.” It is, perhaps, enough to know on the authority of his distinguished kinsman, the author of the *Hibernia Dominicana*, that he was so popularly designated. And in the usually-accepted account of the battle of Knockto, it is recorded that Richard, father of Ulick na Gceann, was the greatest of the Irish at that memorable battle. He was also known as Richard of Dunkellin, from having erected the fortress from which the lords of Clanricarde derive the title of Baron. It must have been a

splendid pile; for though ruined now, the extent and character of the ruins justify the opinion that it was once a residence worthy of the most powerful family in the west of Ireland.

It stood on the banks of the Kilcolgan river, and was near that group of churches to which the names of saints Colga and Foila lend an undying interest. The bay of Maree, at which the great midland highway of ancient Erin terminated, might be seen from its towers. It stood near the historic "red beech" at which the chieftains of Aidhne were inaugurated. Indeed, it is not improbable that the Mac Williams, in their ostentatious zeal for adopting Irish customs, appropriated the inauguration stone, and that transferring it to Dunkellin they had it named "Cahir an Earla," and had it reserved for the ceremony of inaugurating the MacWilliams as chiefs of Clanricarde. Its site is still marked by a low mound near the castle, where the "Cahir" was preserved within the memory of men yet living.

The district from which Ulick Burke assumed his title as earl was extensive. It included the six southern baronies of Galway, namely, Clare, Athenry, Loughrea, Dunkellin, and Kiltartan. This extensive territory derived its designation most probably from Ricard, son of the first Mac William Oughter; though many think it was derived from Richard de Burgo, Earl of Ulster, who claimed by royal grant to be lord in "demayne and service" of this and other parts of Ireland.

Early in the thirteenth century, the O'Flahertys, who were original owners of the barony of Clare, were driven out by the Burkes, and obliged to seek refuge in the wilds of Jar Connaught. The O'Clerys, too, were expelled later in the same century, from the fertile lands in the baronies, and Dunkellin and Loughrea, which are situated in the south east of the diocese of Kilmacduagh, by the younger sons of Walter de Burgo. Hubert established himself at Isser Kelly, and the castle which still remains there speaks of the power and splendour of the MacHubert Burkes, as his descendants were known. His brother Redmond took possession of a considerable portion of the adjoining territory, which was subsequently known as "Oireaght Redmond." The strong

castles erected by his descendants may still be seen in the parishes of Kilbecanty and Kiltartan. But when William de Burgo, Earl of Ulster, was murdered at Carrickfergus, in the fourteenth century, the De Burgo territories and titles became legally vested in the Duke of Clarence, through his wife Elizabeth, the Earl's only child. His kinsmen in the west, seeing that their lands were to become Crown property, resolved to hold, at least, their Connaught possessions in defiance of the Government.

The leaders under whom this daring project was successfully carried out, divided their newly-acquired possessions amongst themselves: and we hear for the first time of MacWilliams—"Eighter" and "Oughter," *i.e.*, the Lower and Upper Burkes.

Sir Edmond Burke, was recognised as the MacWilliam Eighter, *i.e.*, chief of the Burkes of Mayo; and William Burke of "Annakeen," was the MacWilliam Oughter or recognized chief of the Burkes of Galway. They were sons of William Leigh de Burgo—who founded the Franciscan Monastery of Galway, and made it his last resting place, A.D. 1324. This William Leigh de Burgo was descended by a junior line from the first Earl of Ulster.

The Duke of Clarence who was sent to Ireland as Lord Deputy in 1361, strongly urged his claims to the usurped property in the West. Owing to his remonstrances, a commission was appointed to inquire into the nature of his claims, which did tardy justice to his Grace, by deferring their report till after his death, and declaring then that Galway, and certain other important portions of the county belonged to him by right of his wife. But the Government, either through policy or weakness, made no effort to resist the usurpation. England was then weak, and occupied by greater troubles; and besides, its chief aim in Ireland was to keep the native Irish in check; and as the De Burgo's were amongst the most successful representatives of English aggression in Ireland, their revolt was easily condoned. It was under those circumstances that the De Burgos, while repudiating the authority of English law, ostentatiously adopted the language, customs, and dress of the Irish. They

became more Irish than the Irish, in order to conciliate the sympathy and secure the support of the native chiefs amongst whom they lived.

William Burke, the first MacWilliam Oughter, died in 1337, and was succeeded by his son *Ricard*, whose name was retained to designate the territory over which he sought to exercise authority. He was careful, not merely to conciliate the favour of the Irish chiefs by adopting their customs, but to secure their support by marriage alliance. It would appear that he secured Portumna Castle and estates by his marriage with the Lady More, daughter of O'Madden, who was then styled "patron of the literati of Ireland." From this Ricard we reach by three generations, Richard the "Great" of Dunkellin, father of "Ulick Na Gceann," first Earl of Clanricarde. It would be, perhaps, out of place to refer further to their history, save by adding that their marriage alliance with the O'Briens, secured for them the support of the warlike clans of Thomond.

Ulick Burke is referred to by our annalists as the "most valiant of the English of Connaught." His surname "Na Gceann"—of the Heads—by which he was usually known, seems to confirm this tribute to his valour, though we fail to find historical testimony to support it. It is probable that his valour was manifested principally in repelling the attacks of the local chiefs, and in restraining the aggressiveness of his kindred, the MacHuberts, the MacRedmonds, and others. We shall see that he had the ill-fortune of being singularly unpopular with all the native chiefs, who regarded his power amongst them as an abiding menace to their possessions and independence. Indeed, he seems not merely to be unpopular, but to be hated by the surrounding chiefs and their clansmen, as the MacWilliam Oughter was never before detested. Those relations become more sharply accentuated when, in his declining years he was confined as a cripple to the Castle of Dunkellin. So severe was the attack of paralysis from which he suffered then, that he was unable either to ride or move on foot. While his enemies availed themselves of his helplessness, he was deserted by most of his retainers and immediate

dependents. His cattle were seized and his lands plundered, even by his own kinsmen. His foster brethren alone remained true in their allegiance to him under those trying circumstance. Grown confident by impunity, his plunderers at length laid siege to Dunkellin Castle, with the purpose of making him a prisoner, and of seizing what remained of his property and possessions. In the light of such events it was but natural, perhaps, that he should regard his kindred as men who trampled on the dictates of nature, and on his faithless dependents as monsters of ingratitude.¹ His indignation, indeed, knew no bounds at seeing "that they who were bound to him by the closest ties of blood, had hearts so merciless as to deprive him, a cripple, of the necessities of life." The sense of imminent danger revived the fires that were smouldering within him, and roused his dormant energies into action. Summoning his astonished attendants to arms, he cried out for his horse, adding:² "May not the great God who took away the life of my limb, restore it again, and enable me to recover my cattle from the fangs of those merciless thieves?"

Awed by the intensity of his anger, his attendants obeyed their old chief promptly, though reluctantly. He was placed on horseback, though so feeble that he had to be supported in the saddle.³ Nothing daunted, he persisted in his efforts to sit erect, "till at length the bones emitted a sound loud enough to be distinctly heard by his attendants; and in that instant his sinews recovered their natural position and strength." This singular occurrence roused the enthusiasm of his followers, and filled his foes with dismay. Panic stricken, they were powerless to resist or escape his fierce onslaught, and were nearly all put to the sword without mercy. Glorifying in his triumph, Ulick De Burgo had the heads of his slaughtered foes made into a pile, and so vast was this gory monument of his triumph that he was afterwards popularly known as Ulick "Na Gceann" (of the Heads). With the letters patent by which he was ennobled Lord,

Clanricarde transmitted to his children a heritage of hate. Indeed, his titles were mainly the occasion of giving to his profligacy a notoriety which it would not otherwise secure. He was scarcely laid in the grave when three ladies, each claiming to be his wife, instituted a suit at law to decide for themselves and their children their claims to his titles and property. The Lady Grace O'Carroll represented herself as his first and only lawful wife. She was daughter of the Prince of Ely. His son by this lady was Richard Saxonagh, who afterwards succeeded as Lord Clanricarde. During the lifetime of the Lady Grace he espoused Honora De Burgo, and also a certain Maria Lynch, of Galway; and we are informed that on the occasion of his marriage with the latter, he "affirmed and swore there was no impediment to the same." In 1547 Maria Lynch petitioned the Duke of Somerset, setting forth her claims as wife of the deceased earl. In this petition she represents herself as of a "Civile and Englishe ordre of Education and manners, inhabiting within the towne of Galway," and points out that the changes in the late earl's opinions and character, which recommended him to the royal favour, were owing to her influence. "That at the time of their marriage she was a woman of great substance, and that she was entitled to and claimed a third of all his real and personal property. She referred to the marriage articles, which, she alleged, were executed between her and the late earl, and stated that she had secured by them a legal claim to the "Manor and Castle of Kilcolgan," with other stipulations, which he failed to observe. She urged that the marriage of her rival Grace O'Carroll with the late earl was invalid by reason of a prior marriage contracted with O'Melaghlin, who was then living, and, therefore, claimed for her son John his father's coveted titles.

On the 23rd January, 1547, the Lord Protector appointed a commission, with authority to inquire into and decide the subject-matter of the petition. Such an inquiry must have engaged a large share of public attention, and there can be little doubt that it became throughout Clanricarde a subject of eager and factious discussion. This may be inferred from

the record of the annalists, who tell us that "great discussions arose in Clanricarde concerning the lordship."

The Commissioners' finding was published early in the November of the same year. The result was unfavourable to the writer of the petition, though the Lord Protector had, by a private letter, expressed a deep interest in her case. They declared her marriage with the earl void, and consequently refused to recognise her claim to his estates. They left her free, however, to disprove his marriage with Lady Grace O'Carroll, should she afterwards desire to do so; and they recognised the claims of Richard to his father's titles and estates.

But, in consideration of the deception of which the petitioner was a victim, it was stipulated that she should be paid forthwith the sum of £300 by the young earl. It was probably owing to the Lord Protector's private letter that she received even this sum, and that the validity of the earl's marriage with the Lady Grace O'Carroll was left an open question, which might be again investigated whenever a favourable opportunity might occur. But, happily for the fair fame of the Countess of Clanricarde, such an opportunity could not occur. It was well known that her first husband was O'Melaghlin, but his death prior to her marriage with Clanricarde was equally well known. Despite the influence of the earl and his guides in the Reformed religion, the Countess remained true to the religion of her fathers; and whatever else may have been weak in the character of Earl Richard his son, he may, at least, justly claim the merit of fidelity to his faith under very trying circumstances.

J. A. FAHEY.

DR. WINDTHORST : HIS LIFE AND WORK.

AT the close of the Congress of Coblenz, in September of last year, Dr. Windthorst concluded his speech with these words :—

“ And now permit me at the close to express the conviction that we have during these days done a great and beautiful work, and that whenever it will be spoken of it will be said—These are also the decisions of the Congress of Coblenz. I don't know if at the next reunion we shall all meet. That is in the hands of God. But if I do not return to the Catholic Congress, keep me in affectionate memory ; and let me hope, at least, that your prayers will be united to implore peace for me when I am with you no more.”

Since these words were listened to by the assembled Catholic delegates at Coblenz, the great voice that spoke them has become silent for ever. On Saturday, the 14th March last, Herr Ludwig Windthorst, the great Catholic leader, rested after his long life of ceaseless work in that peace for which he had laboured and prayed. Like Mallinkrodt, Reichensperger, Frankenstein, and others, who were once his colleagues, he had devoted his life to the great cause that has been identified with his name ; like them too he has fallen fighting. With this difference, however : they died amidst the first evolutions of the strife ; Windthorst lived to see the battle well-nigh over and won. Otto, one of the most eloquent members of the Prussian parliament, was seized with apoplexy within the precincts of the house, and died in the arms of his colleagues. Mallinkrodt, whom Windthorst succeeded in the leadership, after a long and impassioned speech in defence of the political rights and religious liberty of the German Catholics, caught pneumonia on his way home, and died after a few days' illness. That was in 1874. Frankenstein, who was Vice-President of the Centre Party, fell ill during a sitting of parliament, and was taken home to die. Reichensperger also disappeared from the battlefield in the onset of the

strife, and, like his colleagues already named, had his sword unsheathed and grasped till death.

For some days before his death, Dr. Windthorst had been suffering from a cold ; but he was nevertheless regularly present at the sittings of the Landtag and Reichstag, and of the Education Commission. On the Tuesday morning before he died he took part in a discussion on the taxes on movable property. He never saw the Parliament House again. On the way home with one of his colleagues he complained of being ill, and when he reached his house he had to be helped in by a servant. On Wednesday afternoon he received the last Sacraments, and soon after he became delirious till the end. It was truly the death of a soldier, surrounded with the glory and the pathos of final victory secured, but not yet quite gained.

By the death of Dr. Windthorst, Germany has lost its noblest son, and Europe one of the most remarkable men who have taken a part in its public life during the present century. We cannot have better evidence of how his worth was recognised than the spontaneous expressions of sympathy which from every side poured in upon him during his illness, and consoled his family when he was gone. Wreaths were laid on his tomb in the name of Leopold of Bavaria and other princes, and in the name of every party in the legislature. His praises were pronounced in the Landtag and Reichstag by the presidents of each. A special train was granted by the State to convey his remains to Hanover. At his obsequies in the Church of St. Hedwige the Emperor and Empress were represented. The presidents, besides many ministers and members, represented the Landtag and Reichstag ; and his own faithful colleagues (who afterwards followed his body to the grave) were there in the strength and union that he gave them, to listen to the Prince Bishop of Breslau pronouncing his panegyric, and exhorting them to keep his spirit living. During his illness, the Emperor by his daily inquiries showed an anxiety about him that is rarely shown by sovereign to subject, and the best wreath that adorned his coffin was the one bearing the name of the Emperor and Empress in letters of gold. Around his bier

were gathered his countrymen of every party, creed, and class, to do him honour. The Holy Father sent telegrams of inquiry whilst it was thought that God might spare him. When all hope was over he sent his Apostolic Blessing to console the last moments of the illustrious patient, and when he was laid in the tomb he addressed a letter to his colleagues of the Centre, reminding them that, although he who united them and had been their bond of unity for twenty years was gone, his principles remain, and that the unselfish aspirations with which he had inspired them should continue to inspire them still.

He who, holding such a prominent and delicate position as Dr. Windthorst did, gains and holds so universal a popularity to the end, must have gifts of head and heart which not every generation brings. Even the Press, which has some fault to find with everyone, had none to find with Windthorst. The *Nord-Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, for so long, and especially during Bismarck's power, the implacable enemy of the Centre and of the Centre's leader, said :—

“The leader of the Centre has been called to the other life in a moment when the most signal services for the well-being of the country might have been hoped from him, and from every side a wail of sorrow comes for the death of a man who has spent more than thirty years in parliamentary life and leaves incomplete the expectations that were reposed in him. From all, even his political opponents, words of praise are due for the ability and constancy with which he has served his political purposes.”

The *Daily News* said :—

“The death of Herr Windthorst removes one of the most redoubtable adversaries of Prince Bismarck. To him more than to anyone else is due the failure of the Chancellor's attempt to bend the Papacy to his will.”

The *Univers* said :—

“His friends will weep for him, his enemies will lament for him also, and nobody will pronounce his name without emotion. What then are the qualities that have made of Ludwig Windthorst a leader so intelligent, a defender so effective, an adversary so feared? The same that Windthorst had found in that good man Hermann Mallinkrodt, the old leader of the Centre. In depicting, at the Twentieth Catholic Congress, held

at Aix-la-Chapelle, the character of Mallinkrodt, Windthorst depicted himself when he said:—‘Our deeply-regretted friend has been a man of faith such as few have; his speeches stirred up the masses, because he was the living expression of a faith still more lively.’ It is that faith inspired him to defend right and justice; it is that gave him all his strength. And therefore, after so many years of struggle, Windthorst leaves the Catholic party of Germany in a state to be envied by all political parties. The Centre is to-day in Germany the party that decides.”

The *Berlin Tageblatt*, which has always opposed him, after having spoken of the great stroke his death is to the Centre party, says of him:—

“Outside his own family and the Centre party, those who suffer the greatest loss are the poor. The sum of money that Windthorst used to give in charity, in spite of his modest means, was certainly surprising. It would not have been possible for him to open his hand so largely to the poor if he had not imposed on himself the greatest simplicity and austerity of life. Nevertheless, the number of postulants who besieged him often exceeded his means of giving.”

Ludwig Windthorst was born on January 17th, 1812. The place of his birth is a quiet village in the Principality of Osnabrück. Here, also, his boyhood was watched over and trained by careful Catholic parents. They were simple and pious, and they brought up their son in a simplicity and piety as deep as their own. The panorama of hill and valley, of woodland and river, shaded into one picture under the blue canopy above, was poetry to his young fancy. It was the poetry of pastoral life, ever elevating and pointing upwards. His father, besides farming at Holdenhof, practised as a solicitor at Osterkappeln, a neighbouring town, where also the family used to hear Mass, and Windthorst went to school in his childhood. The simple manners of the people, the little church where he was baptized, and the church-bell, which at morning and at eve chimed religious memories into his ear, and used to awake in him the religious instincts of childhood, left impressions on him that lived on unfading through the vicissitudes of eighty years.

It was the hope of his parents that their son Ludwig would become a priest, and with that intention he was sent

at the age of ten to the College of St. Charles at Osnabrück. He spent eight years there, and left it with the highest credentials as to proficiency, diligence, and conduct. In the College Books, "faultless and excellent" is everywhere written to his name; and in Latin, German, History, Mathematics, and the Natural Sciences, he is always "very good." Finding that he had not a vocation for the priesthood, he left St. Charles' in 1830, and went to study law at Göttingen and Heidelberg. A certain boyish wilfulness which he showed at home developed here into an unbending will, that marked him out amongst his fellows at the University as a man of independent spirit and unflinching purpose. But, though his will was unbending, he was not wilful. Honest judgment was his guide always, and he who would yield to no man for man's own sake, would yield to any man for the sake of right and truth. He was remarkable for quick perception, a practical grasp of questions, and a singular gift of "taking the measure" of men. Even at Heidelberg he never forgot his faith. The influence of associations there did not turn him from virtue, and he practised his religion with all the simple earnestness which he had learned amongst the villagers of Holdenhof. And it was so to the end.

After a University career of great distinction, he took his degrees and became a member of the bar at Osnabrück. His professional skill and engaging manners brought him an extensive practice in a short time. His way to success was short and straight. At the age of thirty-six, the King of Hanover appointed him Counsellor of the Supreme Court of Appeal in Celle. His political life began during the revolutionary movement of 1848. Through the influence of the Catholic clergy and gentry he was elected to represent Meppen in the Provincial Landtag of Osnabrück. In 1849 he became a member of the Hanoverian Diet, where he distinguished himself by his able opposition to the unionist tendencies of the national parliament of Frankfort, whose members had offered the Imperial Crown to the King of Prussia. The young parliamentarian at once stood out in the public opinion as a man of singular individuality and of great power. The King of Hanover saw this, and on

22nd November, 1851, he made Windthorst Minister of Grace and Justice. His great career and busy public life did not make him forget that he was a Catholic before all things. In his new position of power he guarded Catholic interests. He procured the erection of the diocese of Osnabrück, and had the Catholic cause represented in the Legislature and at the Court. In 1853 he merged again into the position of a simple deputy, and remained so until 1862, when he was again appointed Minister of Grace and Justice, which he held till 1865. On the 21st October, 1865, he became Attorney-General; but when, in the following year, King George was deposed, and Hanover passed under the sceptre of Prussia, he doffed the gown and led the Guelph party, first in the Constituent Diet, and then in the Reichstag of the North German Confederation. He also became a member of the Prussian Landtag.

It was at this time that he first came in contact with Bismarck. He treated with the Prussian Government as representative of his exiled king, and in his behalf made a treaty with Bismarck, which Bismarck, in the pride of power, afterwards ignored and broke. It is out of the contemptible dishonesty of Bismarck in this breach of public faith that the "reptile press" arose, which was so active in mischief twenty years ago. "It was cat after kind." The "reptile press" was generated out of corruption and shameless deceit, and it faithfully fulfilled its mission of corruption and shameless lying. Bismarck, in the face of the solemn convention entered into with Windthorst, confiscated the property of King George. The sum realised became the capital of the "reptile fund," the interest of which went to pay journalists in Germany and elsewhere, whose brief was to flatter Bismarck, to inspire distrust of the Catholics of Germany, to incense the spirit of Döllingerism, and to insult the Pope. At the close of 1870, France saw its old prestige of power disappear as swiftly and surely as the year that was passing away. Prussia left it prostrate, and Prussia in a sense was prostrate under Bismarck. But, in the plan of Bismarck's policy and purpose, it was not merely the arm of France he had tied up. He saw in France not

only a great nation which he would subdue, but also the traditional defender of the Church, whose life and influence he thought depended on human power. Having run in triumph over a Catholic nation, he thought he could chase and persecute with impunity the Catholics of Germany to death. Well, he did his worst, and failed. That is the simple story of his war against the Church, as it is of many another such war before. It is but history repeating itself—fanaticism foiled ; the persecutor perishing. The “ iron Chancellor ” might not be in sullen seclusion to-day if he had learned in time a lesson which all history teaches—namely, that principle, if *patient* and *persistent*, must in the long run bear down brute force, however mighty. It is so in the nature of things ; but Bismarck, like the first Napoleon, was blinded by power, and did not see it. When he designed to crush the Church, he was pitting himself against a Divine power, which he thought was human. When he undertook to fetter it in Germany, he ignored or forgot to count on the opposition of a man who brought the unifying spirit of the Church into his party, and by it welded them together, till, in the words of one of his colleagues, it became “ like steel, which is hardened by hammering.”

And now those events came in the life of Windthorst, in connection with which his name has been made historic. When Austria and France were subdued and the German Empire was formed, Bismarck’s ambition looked on to the dominion of Europe. The covetous, in great things as in small, easily grow jealous of any phantom which may even seem to come between them and the object on which their heart is set. Bismarck’s scarecrow was “ Vaticanism.” Like many other great men who thoughtlessly convert ridiculous stories into assumptions, he supposed that the German Catholics should, on principle, be the enemies of the Empire ; and that, therefore, they should be crushed, if the Empire was to live. He stupidly suspected that they should, on religious principle, aim at uprooting any constitution whose spirit was Protestant. He feared, also, lest their particularist politics would continue to oppose the Imperial unification which he had been carrying through. Then,

again, Bismarck's goal was European dominion; but European dominion would include Catholic countries, and he dreamt that the German Catholics would be on the side of these against the Fatherland. Moreover, Protestantism does not claim an individuality of its own. As it is the creature of the State, so must it be its slave; and if Catholicism could be wiped out, and Protestantism made the religion of Europe, Bismarck would be master of Europe and of Europe's conscience. But Catholicism has an individuality of its own; and the bugbear of Vaticanism hovered about Bismarck's brain as the phantom of universal sovereignty. So he got alarmed for the safety of the Empire; or, at any rate, he found it convenient to feign alarm.

Bismarck and Dr. Falk claimed for the State the right to inquire into and decide whether a Catholic bishop or priest was orthodox or not. They declared Reinkens and Wollmann both genuine Catholics, and so gave the former a bishopric and the latter a parish. After all, the Great Chancellor was a broad-minded man. He was not particular as to the form of religion; it might be Lutheran or Popish, or a simulacrum of either. What was essential and heaven-decreed was, that it should be cast in the living mould of Bismarck's wishes. This aggressive spirit of stateocracy showed itself in various symptoms from 1871, but it burst upon the German Catholics in the full fierceness of persecution by the Falk Laws of 1873. Religious orders were proscribed, bishops were imprisoned and banished; parishes were deprived of their pastors; church property was confiscated; ecclesiastical students were ordered into Protestant Universities to learn Catholic theology from Bismarck's professors! Politicians of every shade hailed the coming disappearance of Catholicism. Conservatives and Liberals, divided in most things, were united in this. "Herod and Pilate had again made friends," said the Catholics in derision. The author of the May Laws, in introducing them, said that they were framed in order "to prepare the way to a firm and lasting peace." "Yes, the peace of the grave," replied Mallinkrodt. "Just as the early Christians," said Windthorst, "could not submit to the unlawful demands of paganism, so the Christians of to-day are

bound to withhold submission to unjust and conscience-violating laws." "I suppose," said Baron Schorlemer, retorting on Bismarck, "*we* are also numbered amongst the Catilines of the State; but permit me to say that, in my opinion, there is one special Catiline present by whom the peace of the nation is threatened." The last words of Catholic protest spoken during the debate on the May Laws were these:—"Make, then, if you will, this new law. Decree this new Draconian code, if you will. But be sure of this, you shall never see it carried out, for we shall never yield." They were the words of Schorlemer, and his colleagues were as defiant as himself. The sequel will show that the pledge was kept.

Several States, formerly independent, were absorbed in the new German Empire. Although they had lost their independence, they had still national aspirations to foster and national interests to guard. Any of them would be powerless before the centralising influence of Bismarck. It would have been madness to rebel, and it would have been suicidal to tamely take whatever Bismarck might offer. Their only hope lay in making common cause; but then, as far as national interests went, they had so little in common. Bismarck's own policy suggested a common ground on which many of them might stand. It was quite clear that he meant to crush the Catholic Church throughout the Empire, and it became the duty of the Catholics of the different states not to let him. But a great creative power was needed to unite so many scattered elements into one. A master-mind was necessary to gather them together, and out of them to form a united force. A master-will was needed to maintain and work it when formed. But no man, however strong in purpose, however able or eloquent, would be equal to such a project, unless he were a man also whose private character was unstained, and whose public life was beyond suspicion. Such Mallinkrodt proved himself to be; such was Windthorst. He gauged the situation, and saw at once where he was. He saw that the German Catholics could not safely trust their interests to Conservatives or Liberals, nor to any off-shadings of either. They must form a party of their own. They

must, he said, stand in the *Centre*; take what they can get from either, and be independent of both.

When Windthorst and his colleagues of the *Centre* party first singled themselves out to resist the May Laws, they were detested and despised. They were detested, for they dared to champion the Catholic cause, which Bismarck had set himself to destroy. They were despised, for they were few in number, and their leader came from a conquered province, whilst Bismarck was dictator of a mighty empire, with brute force to assert his will, and a drove of place-hunting parliamentarians to do his bidding. It was a wide contrast. "His Little Excellency," as Windthorst was called by his colleagues, with size, appearance, everything against him, and the "Great Chancellor," burly and big, with everything in his favour. It is no wonder that the Bismarckians smiled at what they thought the innocent audacity of the little Hanoverian¹ stranger dreaming of thwarting the will of their master. Could the simple man have reflected at all on the task he had set before himself, or did he know whom he had to fight? Yes, he had, it seems, reflected very much indeed, and he knew them all—the Great Empire, and the Great Chancellor, with his great crowd of boastful bullies behind him.

It was in 1872 that Bismarck began in earnest to persecute, and no sooner did he begin to attack than Windthorst began to defend. He protested against the legislation on civil marriage, and against the dictatorial government of Alsace-Lorraine, for which he claimed the right of parliamentary representation. In 1873 he began the fight against the Falk Laws, of which he left hardly a shred remaining when he died. In the same year he fought for universal suffrage in Prussia. In 1874, besides his fight against the Falk Laws, he protested against the extravagant expenditure of Secret Service money, which was under Bismarck's exclusive control. So the battle went on from year to year until Bismarck's air-castles began to crumble away piecemeal under the patient battering of the *Centre* party. Not a year passed since the formation of the *Centre* party that Windthorst was not pitted against Bismarck in one or more

questions of public interest—the *Kulturkampf* being, of course, a never-failing battleground, till towards the end hardly the ghost of it remained. One year it was the monopoly of tobacco, another year it was the monopoly of alcohol, some new development of the *Kulturkampf*, some fresh military extravagance, or the creation of some new and needless secretaryship for the convenience of Bismarck's friends. But

“Mihi res, non me rebus subjungere conor”

was an unsafe principle for anyone to practise in the face of Windthorst and his party. In the spring of 1866 Bismarck found it necessary to bring in some laws against the Socialists, who threatened to honeycomb the State. Windthorst did not lose the opportunity of showing that the evil which Bismarck was trying to combat was the natural offspring of his dictatorship in the State, and of his impeding the Catholic Church in exerting its moral influence.

The difficulty over Bismarck's Septennate Bill four years ago must be still fresh in the memory of everyone. The action of the Centre party would be decisive, and so Bismarck found himself in Windthorst's power. Bismarck so managed matters that Windthorst's opposition would make him appear opposed to the interests of the Empire, and indirectly on the side of France. On the other hand, to allow the Septennate to pass would be to secure Bismarck in power, and make him independent of the Centre party. Bismarck, to help himself out of the difficulty, had recourse to that authority whose destruction he had been doing his best to compass for nearly twenty years. Like Frederick, eight centuries before, he went to Canossa in sackcloth and ashes. A more miserable humiliation could not easily be witnessed than Bismarck appealing to the Pope, whom he was sworn to crush, to intercede in his favour with Windthorst, whom a few years before he used to despise. For it nearly came to that. The Centre party acted according to the message of Cardinal Jacobini, although with evident reluctance and much hesitation. They acceded to the wishes of the Holy Father in a matter where obedience was neither demanded nor due, and they had not to wait long

for their reward; they returned to parliament with a party more powerful than before. The last three years has been a continued series of successes for Windthorst and his party. Almost every important measure they proposed was carried. Measures in behalf of the working-classes, which Windthorst had for a long time been forcing on the government, but in vain, were embodied into a government bill more than two years ago. The *Kulturkampf* was vanishing so fast that he left hardly a trace of it behind him. One of the most touching circumstances of his long life was the speech which he made in his delirium, a few hours before he died, for the repeal of the law against the Jesuits—almost the only trace of the *Kulturkampf* that remains.

In 1874 Windthorst, as leader of the Centre, set himself against the gigantic machinery of persecution which Bismarck had framed. Bismarck was pledged to crush him. After years of strife, Bismarck declared he was “weary unto death,” and he began to let the *Kulturkampf* cave in. He appealed to the Pope to protect him from Windthorst, and he appealed to Windthorst to save him from the Socialists. He built up the German Empire, and was to extend it over the ruins of the Papacy and of the monarchies of Europe. Windthorst lived to see him deprived of power even in the empire that he had built up. Whilst he fell away into disappointed retirement, Windthorst became a growing power before the public, moving on full of hope and honour to the crown of his political career. Whilst the *Kulturkampf* has become a thing which the German people would even wish history to forget, the Church which it was designed to crush is regaining its lost rights, and the Pope is held in honour by the emperor. In a word, Bismarck’s work has been all but undone; Windthorst’s work has been all but perfected. Bismarck himself has been discredited by the emperor: we have already seen how he has honoured Windthorst. The last effect of his influence whilst living—for the work of his life will bear fruit for ages—was made known to him on his death-bed. Goszler, the Minister of Public Worship, and one of Windthorst’s fiercest opponents, had to resign to make way for another more acceptable to the Centre party. That is a summary of Windthorst’s

work—a work the like of which it has been given to few men to do.

Looking at it humanly, the secret of Windthorst's success and of Bismarck's failure is this: Windthorst fought for principle, Bismarck fought only for power. The *personnel* of a party is sure to change, but principle never changes; and Windthorst, yielding enough in minor points, would on no account loose his grasp of a point which involved a principle. He who fights for power necessarily fights for a party, and is never more than a partisan. It was so with Bismarck. The *Kulturkampf* was not a principle with him; it was only a means to an end—a lever whereby he hoped to extend his power. Hence, according as he saw his power in danger he forsook the *Kulturkampf*. He had not planned it for its sake, but for his own; and when it ceased to serve his purpose he put it aside as one would lay aside an unworkable machine. On the other hand, principle was the guide of the Centre party. Their aim was clear, and their policy was straight, because it was determined by their single purpose. They took care to master every question, and their action in each was regulated by the one great object that had brought their party into being. Their party was formed for a single purpose, and therefore it was held together with a firmness that nothing could disturb. They set about a difficult task in dismal times. Their cause, humanly speaking, was hopeless. It had everything against it—numbers, unscrupulousness, blind prejudice, and brute force. The presence of their little party only provoked a smile; their protests were drowned in derision. They saw bishops and priests imprisoned and exiled, churches and schools and church property confiscated, their children without religious instruction, their friends dying without the sacraments, yet they never once broke out into violence, nor ever once consented to swerve a hairbreadth from the law of God. Their resistance was strictly passive and strictly moral. They trusted that, as they were fighting the cause of God, His Providence would at length inspire the good sense of their countrymen to turn in their favour. And we have seen that they did not hope in vain.

Moreover, the party which Windthorst led were held fast together by the high principle that governed his policy, whilst there was nothing to keep Bismarck's followers together except Bismarck himself and the narrow spirit that he embodied. Windthorst had no hope of temporal advantage to hold out to his colleagues, nor had they any personal ambition to urge them on. They had nothing to work for except the high principle that created their party. Unless they held on to their leader for conscience' sake, there was nothing else to keep them ; and he led them as one having authority. A few years ago the writer was told by Germans that, although Windthorst was as large-minded as leader could be, his colleagues often felt his discipline severely ; but they knew he was necessary, and that without his discipline they could not have himself ; and whenever any of the " young bloods " differed from him time invariably told them that he was right.

But the spring of Windthorst's great power as a public man must be sought in his private life. Whether we consider a man in his domestic, civil, social, or religious relations, we have to go back to the individual in every case. It is the individual that acts always ; and as the individual is, so must his public and private actions be. In his mind and will and heart is to be found the measure of his worth in every sphere. It is quite true that there are spheres of duty where civil worth may be compatible with personal depravity ; but then there are many where it is not so. Some of the most important actions of public life directly flow from, and are dependent on, the principles and conduct that form the individual character. For the character of Windthorst's private life we have a witness in the fact, that, although no man in Germany had so many political enemies, he had not a single personal one. At public banquets, Bismarck always gave him the place of honour. When, owing to his weak sight, he met with an accident some time ago, Goszler was his Good Samaritan. Whenever he walked from his home to the Parliament House, the people would respectfully make way for him along the streets, and help him over the crossings. These, and a hundred other such tokens of regard,

show that he had a place in the affections of his countrymen above all party interests or political struggles. But, the best evidence of the deep impression he made is the extraordinary honour that was paid him by all classes when he was no more. He was a thorough Catholic both in faith and practice, frequenting the Sacraments, observing the precepts of the Church, following the various devotions of the year with the simple piety of the humblest around him. He fully understood the reason of the faith that was in him, and he accordingly valued the great grace of being a Catholic. With him faith was not a mere dry creed to be believed; it was also a religion to be practised: not a mere formula which his intellect accepted, it was also a precept which his will obeyed. He recognised that to keep his faith living in his soul was, above all, his own personal concern, and that the constant practice of it, without which it grows faint, is not more a duty for the humble than for the great. In this his life was a wide contrast to some ignorant creatures (better call things by their right names), who speak and act—and I suppose think—as if they were paying a compliment to the Church, and to the rest of the faithful by being Catholics at all. His life shows, too, that he clearly grasped the truth, that Catholic laymen and Catholic ecclesiastics, as Catholics, cannot have divided interests; that as Catholics, both are equally bound to labour, each in his sphere and according to his opportunity, for the Catholic good. The magnificent church that was consecrated in Hanover last April twelvemonth, is a monument of his devotion to our Blessed Lady. The day before it was consecrated he planted an oak in front of it—a symbol of enduring strength. The people call it *Windthorst's Oak*. Since he began to build that church, the testimonials he got—and they were many—were for the most part in money; for his friends well knew that he would wish it so, and how it would be spent. Every *mark* that was presented to him for the celebration of his golden wedding, two years ago, and on 17th January last, his seventy-ninth birthday, went to complete his church. “Whoever is a friend to our Lady of Hanover,” he used to say, “is a friend of mine; and whatever is done for her, is done for me.” It is hardly

necessary to say, that his body rests now within the sacred building on which his heart was set.

Like all great men, he was simple and unassuming. In Berlin, he and his daughter occupied a "flat" as their residence—an humble home for so great a man. He was good to the poor, almost beyond his means; and, like all who are forgetful of self as he was, he died poor. As single-hearted men usually are, he had a genuine sense of humour, and was always ready to take a joke as well as to make one.

Diminutive in size, his appearance far from prepossessing, he often made a useful subject for caricature in the *Punches* of Germany, especially in the early days of the *Kulturkampf*; and it is said that nobody used to be amused by the artist's wit more than he. Whenever he was put on his mettle in parliament, his speeches were barbed with satire; but it was done with such grace, and it cut so keen, that, although the wound was made, the victim little felt it. When he met with the accident mentioned above, and a report spread that he was much injured, in order to calm his wife's anxiety he wrote to her:—"Don't be at all alarmed, dear; I assure you, my beauty hasn't been in the least disfigured." The point of the joke, of course, was that it would be hard for it to be disfigured. His affable nature and sense of humour made him loved by his colleagues, as his discipline made him respected, and his ability made him admired. It was Malinkrodt first called him the "Pearl of Meppen;" and his colleagues kept it up ever after.

When wiring the news of his death, *The Times'* correspondent, referring to his patriotism, said that he was "a Catholic first and a patriot afterwards." It is quite true. He himself always avowed it; but held that he was a true patriot because he was a true Catholic. He made men feel that; it was by it he convinced them that he was in earnest. The Church and the Fatherland were not for him two divided interests running in parallel lines. As he felt that he who is a father, a citizen, or a politician, or whatever else, is the same individual who shall live beyond the grave, so he felt that the father, citizen, or politician of the present life has his responsibilities in reference to the merit of the next. In

other words, with Windthorst, faith and patriotism were inseparable. Not that he stripped faith of its supernatural character to make it fit his patriotism; for that cannot be: faith that is not supernatural is not faith. With him patriotism was not a mere instinct that nature gave him. It was that, but more: it was also a moral duty for which he was accountable to God. And quite right. It is not only true that we are religious because we are rational, it is also true that we cannot be rational without being religious; for a rational being is ever, and by nature, a moral being. Hence, to divorce one's life—personal, social, or political—from moral responsibility and from God, is as if one would divorce himself from reason. Windthorst well knew and felt this truth. It was not only in his mind; it worked in every fibre of his heart; and, therefore, whilst his faith and patriotism were inseparable, it was not that his faith was merely natural, but that his patriotism had its spring in the supernatural. That this was the ruling habit of his mind and heart is seen in two touching incidents of his deathbed—his *hoch* for the Emperor, and his defence of the Jesuits. These took place whilst he was delirious; they could be but the spontaneous outflows of feeling from his heart, where they had rested long. No motive but sincere loyalty made him rise up in his raving and toast his Emperor. Nothing but sincere devotion to the Church made him speak, as I shall let Mr. Stead describe:—"He was sinking fast, and they were wondering how soon unconsciousness would deepen into death, when the dying man roused himself and began to deliver, as if he were speaking in the Reichstag, a speech in favour of a Bill repealing the provisions of the law against the Jesuits. In silent awe the two sorrowing women listened as Herr Windthorst went on, making point after point, with the same precision and the same earnestness that distinguished him in the tribune, where he evidently imagined himself to be. At last the speech was ended. Then Herr Windthorst lay back on his pillow and never spoke again. It was the swan song of the old Ultramontane leader—the ruling passion strong in death."

Several Catholic laymen of a genius and purpose like

Windthorst's have lived during the present century, but he has only one rival. France has had Montalembert. He was more brilliant than Windthorst, and more literary; but as a statesman he never showed his tact and vigour. Spain has had Donoso Cortes; but he was rather philosophical for a statesman, and his thoughts therefore never took a firm hold of the popular feeling he wished to influence. Frederick Lucas had ability and will enough, but he lived amidst difficulties which a lifetime was too short to subdue. O'Connell is Windthorst's only rival. His personal influence over the Irish people was more than Windthorst's over the Germans; and Windthorst's name will hardly take the lasting hold of popular Catholic feeling throughout the world that O'Connell's has taken. O'Connell, too, in one sense had more uphill work. Windthorst's party at first were few, but they were able, and the Catholic body whom he led had the advantage of colleges and schools before Windthorst's work began. When O'Connell began, his party was practically *himself*. He had to face the traditional ascendancy, and the rooted bigotry of three hundred years. Moreover, whatever education the great body of the Irish people had received was imparted

“ While crouching 'neath the sheltering hedge, or stretched on mountain fern.”

The first obstacle he had to overcome was to be allowed to sit in parliament at all. He then had to form a party, and to unite a people whom a brutal persecution had left nothing more than Horace's *nos numeri sumus*. We of the present generation can but poorly realize how gigantic a work it was to put national life into a people whose history was written in blood, and whose hopes had been cast down by disappointments and betrayals. But whatever be the fittest parallel between Windthorst and O'Connell, either of them is the ideal of a Catholic leader and patriot, whom not every generation sends. It is such an ideal the Holy Father drew out in following letter which he wrote of Windthorst to the leaders of the Centre party:—

“ DILECTI FILII, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM,
 “ Summa animorum conjunctio quae vobis fuit cum egregio

viro Ludovico Windthorst, etsi Nos minime latebat, exploratior tamen Nobis extitit ex iis quae telegraphica scriptione perferri ad Nos curavistis, cummuni vestro et Collegarum Catholicorum nomine, per dilectum filium Nostrum Cardinalem a publicis negotiis administrum. Justo enimvero et acerbo dolore affectos vos esse intelligimus ex insperato ejus viri obitu, cujus religio, integritas, prudentia, aliaque animi ornamenta perspecta prae caeteris vobis fuere, qui ipsum ducem secuti in officii gravissimi perfunctione, non minus laborum et consiliorum socii quam laudis ejus participes extitistis. Vestra enim consensione et suffragiis fretus, maximis rei christianae et publicae temporibus, Ecclesiae rationes et jura strenue defendit, causamque justitiae semel susceptam magno animo tueri pernexit, donec ea se assequutum videret quae animo constanter intenderat. Merito autem partium vestrarum principem eum vos habuisse gloriamini, qui nunquam se adversantium viribus aut popularibus fluctibus gradu moveri passus est, qui ita patriam dilexit et debitam principi observantiam ostendit, ut nunquam haec officia a religionis cultu sejunxerit, atque ita rationum pondere solidaeque eloquentiae robore eos qui contra sentiebant oppugnavit, ut facile agnitu esset, eum veritatis studio ad certandum, non ulla commodi aut honoris cupiditate moveri. Equidem haec ejus merita, uti par erat probatissima habuimus; idque cum alios, oblata occasione, testati sumus, tum nuper hoc anno, cum redeunte anniversaria die coronationis Nostrae, nova honoris accessione ipsum augere voluimus, adlectum nempe inter Equites primi Ordinis Sancti Gregorii Magni insignibus ejus ornare. Quod si morte praereptus hoc amoris et existimationis Nostrae testimonio frui non potuit, certa spes Nos solatur et recreat, quae illum Nobis ostendit amplioribus praemiis a Deo ornatum, eamque adeptum incommutabilem gloriam, qua nulla illustrior ac beatior est hominibus expetenda.

“Vos interim, Dilecti Filii, virtutis memores et exemplorum tanti ducis, firmiter vestigia ejus insistite, arctam inter vos retinete concordiam, quam ipse in eo cui praefuit agmine naviter studioseque servavit, ac certum habete quod ille semper animo defixum habuit, prosperitati et gloriae communis eo consultius a vobis prospectum iri, quo impensius vos praebueritis fideles Deo et Ecclesiae Matri obsequentes. Sic vos sociosque vestros propitius Deus tueatur ac sospitet, ejusque favoris auspex sit Apostolica Benedictio, quam vobis singulis universis peramanter impertimus.

“Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xix Martii An. mdccxcxi.

“Pontificatus Nostri decimo quarto,

“LEO, PP. XIII.”

Liturgical Questions.

I.

QUESTIONS ON THE USE OF FOLDED CHASUBLES.

II.

SHOULD THE PASSION BE SUNG BY DEACONS?

"You would greatly oblige me by answering the following questions in next month's I. E. RECORD:—

"1. Why, during Advent and Lent at solemn masses *de tempore*, in cathedrals and large churches, do the deacon and sub-deacon wear chasubles in place of the dalmatic and tunic? Why are the chasubles folded before the breast? Why does the sub-deacon take off his while singing the Epistle? Why does the deacon take his off before the Gospel, and not put it on until after the Communion? Why, in small churches, do the deacon and sub-deacon not wear dalmatic and tunic, nor folded chasubles?

"2. Is it necessary that the three who sing the Passion on Palm Sunday and Good Friday should be deacons? May three clerics sing it? "B. I. R."

1. The long array of questions into which our correspondent breaks up his first inquiry may be all answered together in a very few words. The all-sufficient reason for each and everyone of the practices about which he inquires is that they are prescribed by the rubrics of the missal.¹ But if he wishes to learn the reason for the existence of this provision of the rubrics, the task of satisfying him cannot be performed quite so easily. The following, however, he may regard as a fair summary of the universally-received opinion on this point.

The dalmatic and tunic are vestments of joy, and consequently do not suit seasons of penance when the sorrow that rends "the hearts and not the garments" is supposed to actuate the faithful. But in large churches, in which the ceremonies of the Church are wont to be carried out with great solemnity and pomp, it would be unbecoming for the

¹ Part i., tit. 19, 6, 7.

deacon and sub-deacon to assist during the entire mass in alb alone. Hence, at the time of the introduction of the dalmatic and tunic, the chasuble, which up to that time had been always used by the deacon and sub-deacon in solemn mass, was still retained during the penitential seasons. Two reasons are given for the folding of the chasubles worn by the sacred ministers. First, it is said that the fold is merely intended to make the chasubles of the sacred ministers appear somewhat different from that of the celebrant. And, again, others say that the fold is the remnant of an ancient practice dating from the time when the chasuble was the proper vestment for the sacred ministers, and rendered necessary on account of the peculiar form then given to this vestment. For at that time the chasuble was made to cover the entire body from the neck to the feet, and had no aperture but the one which permitted it to pass over the head on to the shoulders. Hence, in order to give freedom to the hands, it was necessary to fold the front part of the chasuble as high as the breast. At first the sacred ministers had to go through the folding process each time they had any duty to perform that required the use of the hands; but this was so awkward and troublesome, that the practice was soon introduced of folding them, and securing the fold once for all.¹

It is not difficult to understand why the sacred ministers should lay aside the folded chasubles at certain parts of the mass. They have no longer a right to the use of the chasuble, nor is it any longer a proper vestment for their office. Accordingly, while they are performing the duties peculiar to their office they must lay it aside. For this reason the sub-deacon divests himself of it before reading the Epistle, and resumes it after discharging this function; because the reading of the Epistle, and this alone, is the special duty of the sub-deacon. The deacon's duties, however, extend from the Gospel to the Communion, both inclusive, and hence during all this part of the mass he does not wear the chasuble.

¹ See Merati, Par. iv., tit. 1, n. 4.

There is no very satisfactory explanation given of the distinction drawn in this matter between small churches and churches that are not small. It is very likely that the non-use of folded chasubles in the former is prescribed by the rubrics with a view to sparing the resources of poor churches; or, as some say, with the view merely of accentuating the distinction in importance between the two classes of churches.

2. If possible, the three who sing the Passion should be in deacon's orders, *at least*. We say "*at least*," for, of course, priests may discharge this office. But if neither deacons nor priests can be had conveniently, the celebrant, deacon, and sub-deacon of the mass may themselves sing the Passion;¹ or it may be sung by the celebrant of a private mass and two clerics, but it may not be sung by three clerics. If the celebrant sings a part he stands on the predella, as when reading the Gospel, and sings the verses marked ✠, and reads in a low tone the parts sung by the others; and if the deacon and sub-deacon of the mass sing the parts along with the celebrant the former sings the verses marked C, the latter those marked S.

III.

WHAT MASS IS TO BE SAID IN CONVENT CHAPELS?

"Kindly answer the following questions in next issue of the I. E. RECORD:—

"1. We have an *Ordo* with the prayer for our society; one of the priests is chaplain to a convent; what mass must he say? Can he follow his own *Ordo*, or must he be guided by the *Ordo* of the diocese?

"2. Can a religious at any time, saying mass transitorily in an oratory or a convent chapel, always say the mass in accordance with his office?

"It very often happens that if I am to celebrate in a convent, according to the rules *pro Ecclesia aliena*, I have to say mass twice of the same, *bis de eodem*, v.g. in this diocese St. Antoninus is fixed upon the 11th of May; in our *Ordo* his feast is on the 10th.

¹ S. R. C., Jan. 10, 1852, n. 5166, and authors.

If I celebrate on the 11th in a convent chapel, must I go by the *Ordo* of the diocese or my own?

"Your reply will be instructive to very many priests throughout the country.

"A PRIEST OF THE SOCIETY OF THE HOLY GHOST."

Before answering these questions it is necessary to distinguish between the two great classes into which nuns may be divided. Nuns are either bound by their profession to recite the entire canonical office, or they are not. In the convent chapel of a community belonging to the former class the chaplain, or any priest celebrating the community mass, *may* always celebrate the mass corresponding to the office of the nuns, although his own office be of higher rite. And he *is bound* to celebrate the mass corresponding with their office as often as he has to celebrate a solemn mass or a *missa cantata*, and also when the nuns have an office of double rite, the colour of which differs from that of his own office.¹

As nuns who are not bound to recite the canonical office have no proper office their chapels possess no privilege, and are, therefore, to be regarded as private oratories as far as the present question is concerned.² And a priest celebrating in a private oratory is always bound³ to say the mass corresponding with the office which he himself recites, whatever may be the rite or colour of the office of the particular diocese or parish in which the oratory is situated. To this there is just one exception, viz., the office of the patron of the place, the mass corresponding with which must be said, even in private oratories, by all priests celebrating within the patronal limits.

1. From these principles it is easy to infer what reply

¹ See De Herdt, *Praxis Liturgiae*, v. 1, n. 98; Wapelhorst, n. 36; Bouvry, part 2, sect. 2; and decrees S. R. C. cited by these authors.

² "In *Oratorio privato* autem Missa semper concordare debet cum officio Celebrantis . . . item [juxta auctores probatos *Oratoris privati* in hac re aequiparari possunt] *Oratoria publica Monialium*, quae non sunt ad chorum professae, neque recitent officium canonicum, sed, ut plurimum, officium B. M. V." Wapelhorst, *l. c.*

³ Unless, of course, on days which permit private votive and *requiem* masses.

should be given to our esteemed correspondent. As he mentions the diocesan *Ordo*, we may take it for granted that the convent in question belongs to the latter and not to the former class of nuns. Hence not only may he follow his own *Ordo* when celebrating in it, but he is bound to follow it, and to celebrate the mass corresponding with the office which he recites, unless in the cases above excepted.

2. The same reply is to be given to the second question. In a private oratory, or in a convent chapel, a religious, or any other priest "saying mass transitorily," ought always to say the mass corresponding with his office.

D. O'LOAN.

Documents.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE LEO XIII.
"DE CONDITIONE OPIFICUM."

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE
XIII. LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES
ARCHIEPISCOPOS ET EPISCOPOS UNIVERSOS CATHOLICI ORBIS
GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

DE CONDITIONE OPIFICUM.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIB
ET EPISCOPIS UNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS GRATIAM ET COM-
MUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Rerum novarum semel excitata cupidine, quae diu quidem com-
movet civitates, illud erat consecuturum ut commutationum studia
a rationibus politicis in oeconomicarum cognatum genus aliquando
defluerent. Revera nova industriae incrementa novisque euntes
itineribus artes: mutatae dominorum et mercenariorum rationes
mutuae: divitiarum in exiguo numero affluentia, in multi-
tudine inopia: opificum cum de se confidentia maior, tum inter
se necessitudo coniunctior, praeterea versi in deteriora mores,
effecere ut certamen erumperet. In quo quanta rerum momenta

vertantur, ex hoc apparet, quod animos habet acri expectatione suspensos: idemque ingenia exercet doctorum, concilia prudentium, conciones populi, legumlatorum iudicium, consilia principum, ut iam caussa nulla reperiatnr tanta, quae teneat hominum studia vehementius.

Itaque, proposita Nobis Ecclesiae caussa et salute communi, quod alias consuevimus, Venerabiles Fratres, datis ad vos Litteris de imperio politico, de libertate humana, de civitatum constitutione christiana, aliisque non dissimili genere, quae ad refutandas opinionum fallacias opportuna videbantur, idem nunc faciendum *de conditione opificum* iisdem de caussis duximus. Genus hoc argumenti non semel iam per occasionem attigimus: in his tamen litteris totam data opera tractare quaestionem apostolici muneris conscientia monet, ut principia emineant, quorum ope, uti veritas atque aequitas postulant, dimicatio dirimatur. Caussa est ad expediendum difficilis, nec vacua periculo. Arduum siquidem metiri iura et officia, quibus locupletes et proletarios, eos qui rem, et eos qui operam conferant, inter se oportet contineri. Periculosa vero contentio, quippe quae ab hominibus turbulentis et callidis ad pervertendum iudicium veri concitandamque seditiose multitudinem passim detorquetur. Utcumque sit, plane videmus, quod consentiunt universi, infimae sortis hominibus celeriter esse atque opportune consulendum, cum pars maxima in misera calamitosaque fortuna indigne versentur. Nam veteribus artificum collegiis superiore saeculo deletis, nulloque in eorum locum suffecto praesidio, cum ipsa instituta legesque publicae avitam religionem exuissent, sensim factum est ut opifices inhumanitati dominorum effrenataeque competitorum cupiditati solitarios atque indefensos tempus tradiderit. Malum auxit usura vorax, quae non semel Ecclesiae iudicio damnata, tamen hominibus avidis et quaestuosis per aliam speciem exercetur eadem: huc accedunt et conductio operum et rerum omnium commercia fere in paucorum redacta potestatem, ita ut opulenti ac praedivites perpauca prope servile iugum infinitae proletariorum multitudini imposuerint.

Ad huius sanationem mali *Socialistae* quidem, sollicitata egentium in locupletes invidia, evertere privatas bonorum possessiones contendunt oportere, earumque loco communia universis singulorum bona facere, procurantibus viris qui aut municipio praesint, aut totam rempublicam gerant. Eiusmodi translatione bonorum a privatis ad commune, mederi se posse praesenti malo arbitrantur, res et commoda inter cives aequabiliter

partiendo. Sed est adeo eorum ratio ad contentionem dirimendam inepta, ut ipsum opificum genus afficiat incommodo: eademque praeterea est valde iniusta, quia vim possessoribus legitimis affert, pervertit officia reipublicae, penitusque miscet civitates.

Sane, quod facile est pervidere, ipsius operae, quam suscipiunt qui in arte aliqua quaestuosa versantur, haec per se caussa est, atque hic finis quo proxime spectat artifex, rem sibi quaerere privatoque iura possidere uti suam ac propriam. Is enim si vires, si industriam suam alteri commodat, hanc ob causam commodat ut res adipiscatur ad victum cultumque necessarias: ideoque ex opera data ius verum perfectumque sibi quaerit non modo exigendae mercedis, sed et collocandae uti velit. Ergo si tenuitate sumptuum quicquam ipse comparsit, fructumque parsimoniae suae, quo tutior esse custodia possit, in praedio collocavit, profecto praedium istiusmodi nihil est aliud, quam merces ipsa aliam induta speciem: proptereaque coemptus sic opifici fundus, tam est in eius potestate futurus, quam parta labore merces. Sed in hoc plane, ut facile intelligitur, rerum dominium vel moventium vel solidarum consistit. In eo igitur quod bona privatorum transferre *Socialistae* ad commune nituntur, omnium mercenariorum faciunt conditionem deteriore, quippe quos, collocandae mercedis libertate sublata, hoc ipso augendae rei familiaris utilitatumque sibi comparandarum spe et facultate despoliant.

Verum, quod maius est, remedium proponunt cum iustitia aperte pugnans, quia possidere res privatim ut suas, ut est homini a natura datum. Revera hac etiam in re maxime inter hominem et genus interest animantium ceterarum. Non enim se ipsae regunt belluae, sed reguntur gubernanturque duplici naturae instinctu: qui tum custodiunt expectant in eis facultatem agendi, viresque opportune evolvunt, tum etiam singulos earum motus exsuscitant iidem et determinant. Altero instinctu ad se vitamque tuendam, altero ad conservationem generis ducuntur sui. Utrumque vero commode assequuntur earum verum usu quae adsunt, quaeque praesentes sunt: nec sane progredi longius possent, quia solo sensu moventur rebusque singularibus sensu perceptis. Longe alia hominis natura. Inest in eo tota simul ac perfecta vis naturae animantis, ideoque tributum ex hac parte homini est, certe non minus quam generi animantium omni, ut rerum corporearum fruatur bonis. Sed natura animans quantumvis cumulate possessa, tantum abest ut naturam circumscribat

humanam, ut multo sit humana natura inferior, et ad parendum huic obediendumque nata. Quod eminet atque excellit in nobis, quod homini tribuit ut homo sit, et a belluis differat genere toto, mens seu ratio est. Et ob hanc causam quod solum hoc animal est rationis particeps, bona homini tribuere necesse est non utenda solum, quod est omnium animantium commune, sed stabili perpetuoque iure possidenda, neque ea dumtaxat quae usu consumuntur, sed etiam quae, nobis utentibus, permanent.

Quod magis etiam apparet, si hominum in se natura altius spectetur. Homo enim cum innumerabilia ratione comprehendat, rebusque praesentibus adiungat atque annectat futuras, cumque actionum suarum sit ipse dominus, propterea sub lege aeterna, sub potestate omnia providentissime gubernantis Dei, se ipse gubernat providentia consilii sui: quamobrem in eius est potestate res eligere quas ad consulendum sibi non modo in praesens, sed etiam in reliquum tempus, maxime iudicet idoneas. Ex quo consequitur, ut in homine esse non modo terrenorum fructuum, sed ipsius terrae dominatum oporteat, quia e terrae fetu sibi res suppeditari videt ad futurum tempus necessarias. Habent cuiusque hominis necessitates velut perpetuos redditus ita ut hodie expletae, in crastinum nova imperent. Igitur rem quamdam debet homini natura dedisse stabilem perpetuoque mansuram, unde perennitas subsidii expectari posset. Atque istiusmodi perennitatem nulla res praestare, nisi cum ubertatibus suis terra, potest.

Neque est, cur providentia introducat^{ur} reipublicae: est enim homo, quam respublica, senior: quocirca ius ille suum ad vitam corpusque tuendum habere natura ante debuit quam civitas ulla coisset. Quod vero terram Deus universo generi hominum utendam, fruendam dederit, id quidem non potest ullo pacto privatis possessionibus obesse. Deus enim generi hominum donavisse terram in commune dicitur, non quod eis promiscuum apud omnes dominatum voluerit, sed quia partem nullam cuique assignavit possidendam, industriae hominum institutisque populorum permissa privatarum possessionum descriptione. Ceterum utcumque inter privatos distributa, inservire communi omnium utilitati terra non cessat, quoniam nemo est mortalium, quin alatur eo, quod agri efferunt. Qui re carent, supplent opera: ita ut vere affirmari possit, universam comparandi victus cultusque rationem in labore consistere, quem quis vel in fundo insumat suo, vel in arte aliqua operosa, cuius merces tandem non aliunde, quam a multiplici terrae fetu ducitur, cum eoque permutatur.

Qua ex re rursus efficitur, privatas possessiones plane esse secundum naturam. Res enim eas, quae ad conservandam vitam maximeque ad perficiendam requiruntur, terra quidem cum magna largitate fundit, sed fundere ex se sine hominum cultu et curatione non posset. Iamvero cum in parandis naturae bonis industriam mentis viresque corporis homo insumat, hoc ipso applicat ad sese eam naturae corporeae partem, quam ipse percoluit, in qua velut formam quamdam personae suae impressam reliquit; ut omnino rectum esse oporteat, eam partem ab eo possideri uti suam, nec ullo modo ius ipsius violare cuiquam licere.

Horum tam perspicua vis est argumentorum, ut mirabile videatur, dissentire quosdam exoletarum opinionum restitutores: qui usum quidem soli, variosque praediorum fructus homini privato concedunt: at possideri ab eo ut domino vel solum, in quo aedificavit, vel praedium quod excoluit, plane ius esse negant. Quod cum negant, fraudatum iri partis suo labore rebus hominem, non vident. Ager quippe cultoris manu atque arte subactus habitum longe mutat: e silvestri frugifer, ex infecundo ferax efficitur. Quibus autem rebus est melior factus, illae sic solo inhaerent miscenturque penitus, ut maximam partem nullo pacto sint separabiles a solo. Atqui id quemquam potiri illoque perfrui, in quo alius desudavit, utrumne iustitia patiatur? Quo modo effectae res caussam sequuntur a qua effectae sunt, sic operae fructum ad eos ipsos qui operam dederint, rectum est pertinere. Merito igitur universitas generis humani, dissentientibus paucorum opinionibus nihil admodum mota, studioseque naturam intuens, in ipsius lege naturae fundamentum reperit partitionis bonorum, possessionesque privatas, ut quae cum hominum natura pacatoque et tranquillo convictu maxime congruant, omnium saeculorum usu consecravit.¹ Leges autem civiles, quae, cum iustae sunt, virtutem suam ab ipsa naturali lege ducunt, id ius, de quo loquimur, confirmant ac vi etiam adhibenda tuentur. Idem divinarum legum sanxit auctoritas, quae vel appetere alienum gravissime vetant. *Non concupisces uxorem proximi tui: non domum, non agrum, non ancillam, non bovem, non asinum et universa quae illius sunt.*¹

Iura vera istiusmodi, quae in hominibus insunt singulis, multo validiora intelliguntur esse si cum officiis hominum in convictu domestico apta et connexa spectentur. In deligendo genere vitae

¹ Deut. v. 21.

non est dubium, quin in potestate sit arbitrioque singulorum alterutrum malle, aut Iesu Christi sectari de virginitate consilium, aut maritali se vincolo obligare. Ius coniugii naturale ac primigenum homini adimere, caussamve nuptiarum praecipuam, Dei auctoritate initio constitutam, quoquo modo circumscribere lex hominum nulla potest. *Crescite et multiplicamini.*¹ En igitur familia, seu societas domestica, perparva illa quidem, sed vera societas, eademque omni civitate antiquior; cui propterea sua quaedam iura officiaque esse necesse est, quae minime pendeant a republica. Quod igitur demonstravimus, ius dominii personis singularibus natura tributum, id transferri in hominem, qua caput est familiae, oportet: immo tanto ius est illud validius, quanto persona humana in convictu domestico plura complectitur. Sanctissima naturae lex est, ut victu omnique cultu paterfamilias tueatur, quos ipse procrearit: idemque illuc a natura ipsa deducitur, ut velit liberis suis, quippe qui paternam referunt et quodam modo producunt personam, acquirere et parare, unde se honeste possint in ancipiti vitae cursu a misera fortuna defendere. Id vero efficere non alia ratione potest, nisi fructuosarum possessione rerum, quas ad liberos hereditate transmittat. Quemadmodum civitas, eodem modo familia, ut memoravimus, veri nominis societas est, quae potestate propria, hoc est paterna, regitur. Quamobrem, servatis utique finibus quos proxima eius causa praescripserit, in deligendis adhibendisque rebus incolumitati ac iustae libertati suae necessariis, familia quidem paria saltem cum societate civili iura obtinet. Paria saltem diximus, quia cum convictus domesticus et cogitatione sit e re prior, quam civilis coniunctio, priora quoque esse magisque naturalia iura eius officiaque consequitur. Quod si cives, si familiae, convictus humani societatisque participes factae, pro adiumento offensionem, pro tutela deminutionem iuris sui in republica reperirent, fastidienda citius, quam optanda societas esset.

Velle igitur ut pervadat civile imperium arbitratu suo usque ad intima domorum, magnus ac perniciosus est error. Certe si qua forte familia in summa rerum difficultate consilii inopia versetur, ut inde se ipsa expedire nullo pacto possit, rectum est subveniri publice rebus extremis: sunt enim familiae singulae pars quaedam civitatis. Ac pari modo sicubi intra domesticos parietes gravis extiterit perturbatio iurium mutuatorum, suum cuique ius potestas publica vindicato: neque enim hoc est ad se

rapere iura civium, sed munire atque firmare iusta debitaque tutela. Hic tamen consistant necesse est, qui praesint rebus publicis: hos excedere fines naturæ non patitur. Patria potestas est eiusmodi, ut nec extingui, neque absorberi a republica possit, quia idem et commune habet cum ipsa hominum vita principium. *Filii sunt aliquid patris*, et velut paternae amplificatio quaedam personae: proprieque loqui si volumus, non ipsi per se, sed per communitatem domesticam, in qua generati sunt, civilem ineunt ac participant societatem. Atque hac ipsa de caussa, quod filii sunt *naturaliter aliquid patris*. . . *antequam usum liberi arbitrii habeant, continentur sub parentum cura*.¹ Quod igitur *Socialistae*, posthabita providentia parentum, introducunt providentiam reipublicae, faciunt, *contra iustitiam naturalem*, ac domorum compingem dissolvunt.

Ac praeter iniustitiam, nimis etiam apparet qualis esset omnium ordinum commutatio perturbatioque, quam dura et odiosa servitus civium consecutura. Aditus ad invidentiam mutuam, ad obtrectationes et discordias patefieret: ademptis ingenio singulorum sollertiaeque stimulis, ipsi divitiarum fontes necessario exarescerent: eaque, quam fingunt cogitatione, aequabilitas, aliud revera non esset nisi omnium hominum aequae misera atque ignobilis, nullo discrimine, conditio. Ex quibus omnibus perspicitur, illud *Socialismi* placitum de possessionibus in commune redigendis omnino repudiari oportere, quia iis ipsis, quibus est opitulandum, nocet; naturalibus singulorum iuribus repugnât, officia reipublicae tranquillitatemque communem perturbat. Maneat ergo, cum plebi sublevatio quaeritur, hoc in primis haberi fundamenti instar oportere, privatas possessiones inviolate servandas. Quo posito, remedium, quod exquiritur, unde petendum sit, explicabimus.

[*His verbis finem pars prima habet. Continuabitur.*]

S. CONGREGATIO CAEREMONIALIS.

THE USE OF THE TUCHETTO AT A CEREMONY.

In comitiis ad Vaticanum habitis die 20 Maii 1890 inter caeteras quaestiones Sac. Congr. Caeremoniali ad dirimendum propositas actum est etiam, an Eñi et Rñi DD. Cardinales, sive Rñi Episcopi et quotquot ex Indulto Apostolico gaudent usu

¹ S. Thom. II-II., Quaest. x, art. xii.

pileoli, sacro adsistentes, sive seorsim sive collegialiter, teneantur detegere caput ad cantum Sacri Evangelii et dum thurificantur.

Emi Patres, re matura discussa, rescipserunt *affirmative*, atque ita omnino observari mandarunt,

RAPH. MONACO LA VALLETTA, Praefectus.

Aloisius Sinistri, a Secretis.

S. RITUM CONGREGATIO.

1. THE KEEPING OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT IN OUTLYING CHURCHES.

2. THE KEEPING OF THE HOLY OILS IN THE PRIEST'S HOUSE.

COMPOSTELLANA

Rñus Dnus. Iosephus Maria Martin de Herrera et de la Iglesia, Archiepiscopus Compostellanus a Sacra Rituum Congregatione eorum quae sequuntur, opportunam declarationem expetivet, nimirum. I. Quum in pastorali Visitatione Orator ipse deprehenderit in multis filialibus Ecclesiis, seu Oratoriis, alicuius Paroeciae SSmam. Eucharistiam asservari, ubi Missa celebratur tantummodo vel Dominicis vel quando Sacrum Viaticum ad aegrotos ferendum desumitur; reliquum vero temporis spatium nemo illuc accedit, praeter sacristam ad alendam [lampadem, ianuis clausis ceteroquin manentibus: hinc quaeritur. An SSñum Eucharistiae Sacramentum in iisdem Ecclesiis ita servandum permitti possit? 2. In eadem Archidioecesi mos obtinet fere apud omnes paroecias ut Sacra Olea in domo ipsius Parochi, quae rure ab Ecclesia seiuncta est ac distat, serventur: quo in promptu habeantur pro infirmis. Potestne tolerari haec praxis praesertim in civitatibus, ubi Parochi domus Ecclesiae contigua est? Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, exquisito voto alterius ex Apostolicarum Caeremoniarum Magistris, ita rescribere rata est, videlicet. Ad I. *Negative, nisi per aliquot diei horas aditus pateat Fidelibus SSmam. Eucharistiam visitare cupientibus*:—Ad II. *Detur Decretum in una Toletana diei 31 Augusti 1872 ad V.*

Atque ita declaravit et rescripsit die 15 Novembris 1890.

✠ Caj. Card. ALOYSI MASELLA, S. Cong. Praef.

Decretum praedictum in una Toletana.

Dubium V. Possunt Parochi retinere Sanctum Oleum Infirmorum in domo sua, eo quod extra Ecclesiam Parochialem habitent, non obstantibus Sacrae Rituum Congregationis decretis?

Ad V. *Negative* et servetur Decretum die 16 Decembris 1826, in Gandavensi ad III.

Decretum diei 16 Decembris 1826 in Gandavensi.

III. Facti species : "Sacerdotes Curam animarum exercentes pro sua commoditate apud se in domibus suis retinent Sanctum Oleum Infirmorum.

An attenta consuetudine, hanc praxim licite retinere valeant ?

Ad dubium unicum Quaesiti III. "Negative, et servetur Rituale Romanum, excepto tamen casu magnae distantiae ab Ecclesia ; quo in casu omnino servetur etiam domi Rubrica quoad honestam, et decentem, tutamque custodiam."

Notices of Books.

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD. A Manual compiled for the use of the Students of the Royal Scots College, Valladolid. By the Rev. James M'Ginnes, Professor of Scholastic Philosophy and Sacred Eloquence in same College. Glasgow: Hugh Margey, Great Clyde-street. 1891.

THIS little book is not a scientific treatise on sacred eloquence. It is not, to use the writer's own words, "a treatise on rhetoric or belles-lettres." But it is much better. It is a practical treatise on preaching the Word of God. The office of teacher, which every priest having the care of souls is most strictly bound to discharge, is admittedly the most important office of the priesthood. The words of St. Paul : "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel," show us the light in which he regarded this primary duty of every pastor. And as Christ sent St. Paul and the other Apostles, so did He come Himself, not to baptize, *Quamquam Jesus non baptizaret sed discipuli ejus* ; not primarily to work miracles, but to preach to the people, *Exinde cepit Jesus praedicare*. This same ministry of preaching and teaching every priest has entrusted to him the day he is appointed the spiritual guide of others. And woe to him if he discharge it not. *Vae enim mihi est si non evangelizavero*. Woe also to him if he discharge it negligently, or without that careful and intelligent preparation which the nature of the duty demands,

which God looks for from His ambassadors, and which the people whom He instructs have a right to expect. This duty being of so paramount importance, one would naturally expect that preparation for the proper discharge of it should hold a foremost place in the curriculum of every ecclesiastical college. We fear, however, that this is not so with regard to all such colleges. But that it is so in the Royal Scot's College, Valladolid, this admirable little book of Father M'Ginnes's abundantly proves.

"The manual is only a compilation; as such, is mine, and is defective; the things compiled are not mine, are good things, and worthy of study and imitation." Such is the writer's modest estimate of his work, to the latter part of which, whatever may be said of the former, we give our heartiest assent. Any priest who studies, and strives to imitate, what is contained in this manual will preach frequently, and must preach intelligently, interestingly, and fruitfully. "Unless a priest is a holy man," we heard remarked lately by a priest of great wisdom and experience, "not only will he not preach well, but he will not preach at all." This seems to be the opinion of Father M'Ginnes also, who insists on sanctity of life as the most essential quality for effective preaching. Hence he quotes approvingly these remarkable words of the Abbé Dubois:—"The conditions essential for good preaching are:—First, to pray fervently; second, to pray fervently; third, to pray fervently. Prayer will enkindle your zeal, and zeal will make you eloquent."

But in striving to fit themselves in this respect for the preaching of the Gospel, Father M'Ginnes would not have his readers neglect the cultivation of the natural faculties:—

"To be learned theologians," he says, "is not enough: *we must impart our knowledge to our people*; and the student who does not honestly labour to overcome the difficulties in the way of his becoming a fluent and effective speaker, and an intelligible, distinct reader, is crippling his future usefulness on the mission."

He insists strongly on the necessity of the priest being a good reader:—

"The priest on the mission is not only a preacher, he is also by his office a public reader. He has been ordained to this office (*lector*) by the Church, and he is bound to prepare himself for the becoming discharge of its duties. Distinct, intelligible, emphatic, public reading, '*optimum sane, sed eheu! rarrissimum*,' is necessary for a priest. Yet how few can read! and everyone imagines he can!"

How are priests to become good readers? or rather how are ecclesiastical students to be made good readers? Not by a special professor, replies our author quoting from Mgr. Dupanloup, but by every professor in every class.

"Professors . . . should never suffer negligent reading, false pronunciation, or vulgarisms of any kind to pass; these faults must be corrected *from the beginning, and in every class.*"

We commend this extract to the attention of all teachers and professors, whether in schools, seminaries, or colleges, to whose care is committed any portion of the education of aspirants to the ministry of the Word. And we commend, too, most earnestly this manual to every young priest, and to every candidate for the priesthood. It is clear, concise, and well written, and contains within one hundred and fifty pages rules sufficient to guide the young preacher, together with abundant reasons to convince him that the success of his labours, if not his salvation, depends on the manner in which he discharges this duty.

D. O'L.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE IRISH LANGUAGE.

By Rev. William Hayden, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1891. Half-a-Crown.

THIS is the preface to Fr. Dunlevy's Irish and English Catechism, published during the Author's lifetime, at Paris, in 1742. As the editors of the second edition of that work omitted the preface altogether, and as the first edition had long become very scarce, Fr. Hayden, judging that such a specimen of classic Irish might be turned to good account, published it in an attractive form with the original text, the author's quaint and vigorous English translation, a vocabulary ample enough for the needs of learners, and some explanatory notes on the more difficult idioms. Fr. Dunlevy's style wants but very little of the purity of our last correct writers, the only evidences of decay being the needless use of some particles, and an occasional looseness in the application of certain verb forms. These the editor has animadverted upon, though, considering the havoc they afterwards wrought on the beautiful simplicity and perspicuity of the ancient system of accidence, it appears to us he might have dwelt with stronger insistence on the confusion arising from careless indulgence in these misleading and repellent errors.

This little book will admirably meet the design for which it

was published, namely, to serve as a stepping-stone for beginners between the elementary primers and difficult Irish prose'; and as such it deserves every success. But who is responsible for its price? Exclusive of editorial matter and the writer's translation, it contains only fourteen pages of text, and is marked at half-a-crown. If the fault lies with the editor, his readiness to put another very dear book on the market squares awkwardly enough with the passage in his preface, wherein he deplores the "prohibitive" prices at which alone standard Irish books may now be had in Dublin. If, however, as may be suspected, this excessive price was fixed by those charged with the production of the little volume, it must be said their action, in thus discouraging the formation of a reading public, shows that they well deserve the severe strictures of a recent American contemporary for their lack of business enterprise and blindness to their own interests.

10MRAmh mic Sneadóigurá agus mic Ríagla, leir an Achar
Eoḡan O'ḡmaína. Teat an Clóda, Ait-Clíat, 1891. One
Penny.

IN pleasing contrast with the above, as far as price is concerned, is this little book of Fr. O'Growney's. It forms the first of a series which the editor has in contemplation for the purpose of bringing a knowledge of Old and Middle Irish masterpieces within the reach of all, by issuing them in versions so simplified as to be intelligible to readers of the modern language, and at a price that bears a fair proportion to the rate charged for English pamphlets of the same size. In these days of advertising and popular organization it is of first importance that the public be reached at once by some cheap, easily-disseminated medium; and the present, as far as we know, is the first practical step towards experiment in that direction for the spread of the Irish language. This system which he adopts of modernizing the ancient language, is the best way to build up a popular Irish style; the diffusiveness of the later diction, when moulded on to the severe framework of the old sentence, gives results as chastely Celtic and as undefiled by influence of English thought and mannerisms as the prose of Keating. Those who have marked what Fr. O'Growney's generous labours have already achieved for the revival of Irish literature, will not need the ample earnest of his powers furnished by the present publication to assure them that he possesses both the learning and ability requisite for the performance of this task.

What that task is may best be learned from his prospectus which we here set forth.

"The editor, if encouraged by the sale of this little booklet (copies 1*d.* each ; 12 copies free, any address, 1*s.* ; 50 copies do., 4*s.* 2*d.* or 1 dollar), will continue to publish, in a similar very cheap form, modernized versions of the *Voyage of Maelduin* and of the remaining *Iomramha*, and of other masterpieces of the old Gaelic prose literature. Orders direct to Rev. E. O'Growney, Ballynacargy, Westmeath."

R. H.

A REMINISCENCE OF THE PASSION PLAY AT OBER-AMMERGAU in 1890. By P. J. O'Reilly. London: Catholic Truth Society, 18, West Square, S.E.

THE Author of this handsome booklet treats his subject at once interestingly and naturally. He obviously spared no pains in equipping himself with the available materials for his work ; he shows an extensive acquaintance with the English-written accounts of the famous decennial drama, not merely as enacted in 1890, but also as historically viewed and chronicled since its inauguration in 1633. The performance itself and all its surroundings are examined and described from a practical and thoroughly Catholic standpoint. His narrative of the journey out is of absorbing interest ; and his style, which is uniformly elegant, is in places very picturesque. The illustrations are well-selected, and lend an additional interest to the work.

We can unhesitatingly recommend the *Reminiscence* as replete with information, and eminently readable, and as being as good a shilling's worth as our readers could invest in.

SELECTED SERMONS. By the Rev. Christopher Hughes, Pastor of St. Mary's Church, Fall River, Mass. New York and Cincinnati : Fr. Pustet & Co. 1891.

THE *Selected Sermons* are twenty-five in number, of average length, and of much more than average merit. The language is clear and chaste, and in many places really eloquent, and in the treatment of his subject the preacher is careful to preserve that first quality of every good sermon—unity. The sermons give unmistakable evidence that their author possesses sound theological knowledge, great familiarity with Sacred Scripture, and a wide acquaintance with the facts of history both sacred and profane. In this collection are to be found specimens of nearly every kind of sermon, and to young preachers, at least, we can safely recommend many of them as models.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT AND THE CHURCH OF ST. MARTIN AT LIEGE. By Dean Cruls. Translated by William S. Preston. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oates.

THIS is a history of the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi, and of the development of the worship of the Blessed Sacrament consequent on the spread of this feast, together with an account of the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament at present practised at Liège, the birthplace of the feast. Brief biographical sketches are given of those who were chiefly instrumental in having the feast instituted. The most interesting of these sketches are those of St. Julienne de Cornillon, to whom our Lord first vouchsafed to reveal His wish that the feast should be instituted, and of her two friends, Eve of St. Martin's, and Isabelle of Huy. Mr. Preston deserves the thanks of the Catholic public in English-speaking countries for having put within their reach a history so interesting and instructive. His motive was a highly laudable one.

"I venture to say," he writes, "that comparatively few, even of the Catholics in our country, know the history of the origin and establishment of the Feast of Corpus Christi; and if the perusal of this little book shall stir up the hearts of people to a more lively devotion towards Him who dwelleth on our altars, my object will have been accomplished."

THE LIFE AND LABOURS OF ST. THOMAS OF AQUIN. By Archbishop Vaughan, O.S.B. Abridged and Edited with Preface, by Dom Jerome Vaughan. Second Edition. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. 1890.

THE LIFE OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Edited by Father Pius Cavanagh, O.P. Illustrated. Same Publishers.

THE fact that both these "Lives" of the angelical doctor come to us from the same publishers is a sufficient proof either that they have different objects, or are intended for different classes of readers. The large work by the late Archbishop of Sydney, published in 1871-72, in two portly volumes, was for students and scholars, not for the general public. But in addition to "learned disquisitions on St. Thomas's method, and philosophical expositions of some of his more abstruse writings," which could not be omitted from a work pretending to deal with the "Labours'

of the saint, it contained so much that was interesting, instructive, and edifying for all classes of readers, that the author's brother, Dom Jerome Vaughan, undertook the task of abridging it. The first edition appeared in 1875, and was so favourably received that the present edition was called for a considerable time before it appeared. The learned editor says in his preface to the first edition :—

“In reducing the two volumes of the *Life and Labours of St. Thomas* to their present size, the editor has been guided by the principle of excluding all those chapters and portions of the work which only bear on the life of St. Thomas indirectly, but of scrupulously retaining all that belongs to what may be called his life proper.”

To this principle the editor has pretty closely adhered, though, with all respect for his better judgment, we venture to think that this abridgment would not suffer as a popular life of the saint if the chapters on the “Greek Philosophers,” “St. Thomas and Reason,” and “St. Thomas and Faith,” had been either excluded entirely or considerably cut down.

Father Cavanagh's “Life” is shorter, lighter, less learned, and therefore more popular. The sources from which he drew his facts and inspirations are according to himself “the eloquent and popular life of the saint by the Dominican, Père Joyau, and the rich mines of Tournon and Tocco.” We have no doubt, however, that the learned work of Archbishop Vaughan, either in its original form, or in the abridged form in which it is at present before us, was also consulted. Yet the writers differ in several details. Father Cavanagh is very precise as to the date of the saint's birth. According to him this event happened “either at the end of 1224, or during the first two months of 1225;” while, according to the archbishop, “most reliable authorities put it at the year 1227.” Again, in the “contest of humility” between St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure on the day on which the degree of doctor of theology was conferred on them, Father Cavanagh gives the victory to St. Bonaventure, the archbishop to St. Thomas. “St. Thomas had to yield,” writes the former, “in spite of being the youngest in age, and of St. Bonaventure's rank as General of his Order.” And the latter: “What they were unable to arrange between themselves was settled for them by their friends. Since St. Bonaventure was older than the angelical it was determined that he should be the first to occupy the post

of honour." Both authors give currency to the following anecdote about St. Thomas's infancy in almost the same words:—

"On one occasion his mother took him to the baths at Naples, and a small roll of paper appeared in his hand when they were preparing to bathe him. His nurse tried to take it from him, but he held it fast, and resisted with sobs and tears. His mother at last opened his hand, but finding the words *Ave Maria* written on the scroll, instantly gave it back. The child seized it eagerly and swallowed it—some say in imitation of Ezechiel the prophet."

Without questioning the prudence of retailing stories of this kind, we may venture to ask how an infant, still in the nurse's arms, even though that infant was the future angelic doctor, could have learned that Ezechiel eat a book? For if he swallowed the scroll *in imitation* of Ezechiel, he must have known that Ezechiel had done something similar.

D. O'L.

LIFE OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST. By an Ossory Priest.

Dublin: Duffy & Co.

THE month of June, in which the Baptist's chief festival occurs, is an appropriate time to call attention to this life of the saint. It is a book that should have a wide circulation, not only among those who are specially devoted to St. John, but among others who, without having chosen the Baptist as a special patron, cannot help feeling a deep interest in the story of his life.

Even from a natural point of view the life of St. John the Baptist is a most interesting study. His time was emphatically the era of revolution, a revolution such as never shall or can come again. Geology, biology, politics, philosophy—what is it that attracts us in the history of each of them so much as the great transition periods? Religion, too, has its eras of change, of which, surely, the greatest was that which was ushered in by St. John.

The life of the Baptist connects the Old and the New Dispensations; familiarizes us with the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Jews; introduces us to the higher rites of which those of the Temple were but shadows; above all, it tells us of the country in which Christ lived, of the people among whom He spent His days, their dwellings and customs, and thus enable us to understand more fully His own life and teaching.

Again, the life of St. John, from his miraculous conception to his martyrdom, was in itself of absorbing interest. And the biographer has a distinct advantage in that he has only to collect and reduce to form the materials that are supplied in the Gospels

by the Holy Ghost Himself. After our Lord, there is no other person mentioned in the New Testament of whom we are told so much therein as of St. John. St. Paul comes next ; but then we know little of St. Paul before his conversion, and the Bible record does not include his last years ; whereas of the Baptist we have a full account.

The writer of the *Life* before us makes use of this advantage so largely that it occurs to him that some might consider it a defect in his work.

“Some may be inclined to say that our attempt to give a history of St. John the Baptist is little more than a commentary on those passages from the Gospels in which there is mention of him. We have no objection to the charge, if made. We have very little means of knowing anything of the saint apart from what is said about him in the Gospels. In them, however, we have a considerably detailed and very beautiful account of his miraculous birth, of the office for which he was destined by heaven, and of the manner in which he discharged the duties appertaining to the office thus entrusted to him. We think, therefore, that we could not better perform the task we have undertaken than by quoting at full those parts of the Scripture that bear on the subject, and giving a true and correct explanation of them.”

Anyone who reads the *Life* will acknowledge that the biographer is correct in his views, and that his explanations of the Scripture texts are lucid without any of the parade of learning that is so well calculated to warn off the ordinary devout reader.

And this brings us back to the special reason why this book must be of great advantage to the faithful—it will enable them to relish the Bible account of our Lord Himself. Is it not a pity that our people do not read the Gospels more? It is there that we come into personal contact, as it were, with the God-man, and that we learn to know and love Him. People tell us that they cannot make out the story ; they lack the knowledge of geography, and especially of Jewish things and customs, that would enable them to understand the Gospels separately, and then connect the four into a whole. As a preparation for such a study of the Gospels we can safely recommend this *Life of St. John* ; it contains much of the desired information ; it is written in a neat, simple style, and will serve as a very useful model of what must be done by those who wish to understand our Lord's own life.

W. M'DONALD.

THE BIRTHDAY BOOK OF THE SACRED HEART. Compiled by Vincent O'Brien. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1891.

THIS booklet, for which we have nothing but words of praise, is "a collection of maxims of the saints and servants of God in honour of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, in prose and verse." Mr. O'Brien is to be congratulated as well on the piety which induced him to undertake the labour of its compilation, as on the extensive reading and exquisite taste of which the "maxims" he has selected bears testimony. There is a short but highly instructive preface from the graceful pen of Father M. Russell, S.J., which opens with the following words:—

"This little volume has the distinctive merit of being the first attempt to consecrate to the holiest of subjects a device of literary ingenuity which has of late become very popular. There is a large variety of birthday books, but hitherto none that could, with much propriety, be laid on the table of a convent reception-parlour."

The object of the booklet is twofold. First, to give for each of the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year one or more "maxims" referring to the Sacred Heart; and second, to give space opposite each "maxim" for the name of a friend whose birth-day corresponds with the date for which the "maxim" is put down. The maxims are selected from the very best sources, and as far as we have examined them, are replete with suggestiveness. The book admirably suits its purpose, and we sincerely hope that it will be preferred by Catholics to many non-religious, if not possibly irreligious, birthday books at present in circulation.

THE HOLY FACE OF JESUS. Adapted from the French of the Abbé J. B. Fourault, by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. New York, &c., Benziger Brothers, 1891.

THIS is a series of thirty meditations on the Litany of the Holy Face. The Abbé Fourault, author of the original and larger work, was a priest of the Holy Face, and was distinguished for his zeal in propagating this justly popular devotion. The meditations, in their present form contain a complete summary of what is to be known and practised by the devout clients of the Holy Face.

IS ONE RELIGION AS GOOD AS ANOTHER? By the Rev. John M'Laughlin. 27th thousand.

ON the first appearance of this wonderful book, just four years ago, we were able to speak of it in terms of unstinted praise, and

to wish it God speed on its errand of enlightenment. The fact that in this short time it has reached the almost incredible circulation of twenty-seven thousand is a clear proof that we did not over-estimate its merits. If the intelligent study of it is keeping pace with the sale, it must already have done a very large amount of good. We beg again to recommend it. Those who have not yet read it should do so at once. It will form an invaluable antidote to the pernicious doctrines that have been scattered broadcast within the last few months. We would specially commend it to the attention of those Catholics who are willing to remain Catholics just so long as they are permitted to believe and to practise what they please.

D. O'L.

CONSIDERATIONES PRO REFORMATIONE VITAE IN USUM
SACERDOTUM. Conscriptis G. Roder, S.J. Editio Altera,
Friburgi Brisgoviae Sumptibus Herder.

It is sufficient to say of this little volume that it offers very practical means for attaining its end. It is intended by its author specially for the time of Retreats, in giving which he spent a great part of his life.

HOLY CROSS ABBEY AND THE CISTERCIAN ORDER IN IRELAND By Rev. D. Murphy, S.J.

AN interesting publication is announced by Father Denis Murphy, S.J., whom many of our readers will know as the author of *Cromwell in Ireland*. Among the MSS. in the possession of the Most Rev. Dr. Croke there is one in Latin containing a history of Holy Cross Abbey, County Tipperary, and biographical notices of the chief Irish Cistercians up to the middle of the seventeenth century. With the Archbishop's permission, Father Murphy is editing the MS., adding a translation and notes. The book, of nearly 400 pages, 4to., will contain also an Introduction dealing with the history of the Cistercian Order in Ireland, and supplementing the author's account of Holy Cross itself. The later history and present condition of the abbey are described, and a careful account is given of the Relic of the True Cross, to which the abbey owes its name, now in the keeping of the Ursulines of Blackrock. Several illustrations accompany the text.

BX 801 .I68 1891 SMC
The Irish ecclesiastical
record 47085658

v.12

Does Not Circulate

